



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review

ANNEX



LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

ANNE

1331-41-22

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. EDMOND F. PRENDERGAST, D. D.

RIGHT REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., ASSOCIATE EDITOR,

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum
veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive
confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXXVII.
FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1912.

STATIONER & PRINTER

PHILADELPHIA:
610 SOUTH WASHINGTON SQUARE.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1912,
By J. P. TURNER,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

179577

VSABAL OROBIA72

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Administration in Canada, The Change of—O. S. B.....	1
Ancient Mexico Reviewed by a Modern Traveler—William S. Long	479
Armagh and Its Cathedral—R. F. O'Connor.....	242
Bailey, A. S. A Royal Patroness of Learning.....	612
Balkan Crisis, Servia and the—R. F. O'Connor.....	561
Barrett, O. S. B., Dom Michael. The Kail Glen Monks of Scotland	214
Beginnings of English Protestantism, The—William F. Dennehy	7
Canada, The Change of Administration in—O. S. B.....	1
Cathedral, Armagh and Its—R. F. O'Connor.....	242
Catholic Ideals in Modern French Fiction—A. McMahon....	697
Ceulemans, Rev. J. B. The Metaphysics of Pragmatism.....	310
Change of Administration in Canada, The—O. S. B.....	1
Church, Reginald Pole, Prince of the—Walter F. Desterre	95, 227, 449
Church and State—Right Rev. Mgr. M. M. Hassett, D. D....	266
Civism, Civility and Urbanity—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	692
Clementina Sobieska—E. Cowell	667
Columbanus, The Cult of—John J. O'Shea.....	537
Concordat of 1801? Were the "Articles Organiques" Part of the—Rev. William J. Hegarty	718
Cowell, E.—Clementina Sobieska	667
Criticisms in Kant—Rev. Simon FitzSimons.....	123, 462
Cult of Columbanus, The—John J. O'Shea.....	537
Currier, Ph. D., Rev. C. W. A Word on Troubled Paraguay..	193
Currier, Ph. D., Rev. Charles Warren. The Putumayo Atrocities	658
de Courson, B. A Martyr of the French Revolution.....	497
Dennehy, William F. England Before Emancipation.....	573
Dennehy, William F. The Beginnings of English Protestantism	7
Desterre, Walter F. Reginald Pole, Prince of the Church,	95, 227, 449
Drama and Irish Views, Irish—Rev. George O'Neill, S. J.....	322
Durer's Religion, The Question of Albert—John J. O'Shea..	110
Dwight, Thomas—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	60
Emancipation, England Before—William F. Dennehy.....	573

	PAGE.
Encyclical—Divino Afflatu	152
Encyclical—On the Condition of the Indians.....	737
England Before Emancipation—William F. Dennehy.....	573
English Protestantism, The Beginnings of—William F. Dennehy	7
Evesham, The Revelation of the Monk of—F. M. Steele.....	32
FitzSimons, Rev. Simon—Criticisms in Kant.....	123, 462
Fortey, E. C. The Living Wage—An English View.....	728
French Fiction, Catholic Ideals in Modern—A. McMahon....	697
French Revolution, A Martyr of the—B. de Courson.....	497
Furlong, S. J., Rev. William. Shakespeare in Spain.....	645
Gaelic Literature on the Irish and on the World, Influence of —F. Gilmore	361
Garesché, S. J., Rev. E. F. The Inconsistency of the Materialist	345
Gilmore, F. Influence of Gaelic Literature on the Irish and on the World	361
Hampole, O. P., Rev. Eustace. The Papal Swiss Guards. .286,	369
Hassett, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. M. M. Church and State....	266
Hegarty, Rev. William J. The Lay Veto.....	419
Hegarty, Rev. William J. Were the "Articles Organiques" Part of the Concordat of 1801?.....	718
Inconsistency of the Materialist, The—Rev. E. F. Garesché, S. J.	345
Influence of Gaelic Literature on the Irish and on the World— F. Gilmore	361
Inscriptions of Sinai and Their Relation to Certain Facts of Scripture, The—Rev. A. M. Skelly, O. P.....	678
Irish Drama and Irish Views—Rev. George O'Neill, S. J.....	322
Irish Parliament Restored in Altered Shape, The—John J. O'Shea	332
Irish and on the World, Influence of Gaelic Literature on the —F. Gilmore	361
Justice, Thoughts Old and New About—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.	202
Justin McCarthy—R. F. O'Connor	387
Kail Glen Monks of Scotland, The—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.....	214
Kant, Criticisms in—Rev. Simon FitzSimons.....	123, 462
Law, The Obligation and the Sanction of the Moral—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	408

	PAGE.
Lay Veto, The—Rev. William J. Hegarty.....	419
Literature on the Irish and on the World, Influence of Gaelic	
—F. Gilmore	361
Living Wage—An English View, The—E. C. Fortey.....	728
Long, William S. Ancient Mexico Reviewed by a Modern	
Traveler	479
Long, William S. Through the West Indies to the Panama	
Canal	596
McCarthy, Justin—R. F. O'Connor	387
McMahon, A. Catholic Ideals in Modern French Fiction....	697
Manriques, Battle-Lords and Poets, The—Thomas Walsh....	586
Mariavites, The—Rev. Hildebrand van Amstel, O. P.....	49
Martyr of the French Revolution, A—B. de Courson.....	497
Materialist, The Inconsistency of the—Rev. E. F. Garesché, S.J.	345
Metaphysics of Pragmatism, The—Rev. J. B. Ceulemans.....	310
Mexico Reviewed by a Modern Traveler, Ancient—William S.	
Long	479
Monks of Scotland, The Kail Glen—Dom Michael Barrett,	
O. S. B.....	214
Montecassino—The Inner House of the Beautiful—M.D. Walsh	521
Moral Law, The Obligation and the Sanction of the—Rev.	
John Rickaby, S. J.....	408
Name, The Roman—Rev. Daniel Quinn, Ph. D.....	439
Obligation and the Sanction of the Moral Law, The—Rev.	
John Rickaby, S. J.....	408
O'Connor, R. F. Armagh and Its Cathedral.....	242
O'Connor, R. F. Justin McCarthy	387
O'Connor, R. F. Servia and the Balkan Crisis.....	561
O'Neill, S. J., Rev. George. Irish Drama and Irish Views....	322
O'Shea, John J. The Cult of Columbanus.....	537
O'Shea, John J. The Irish Parliament Restored in Altered	
Shape	332
O'Shea, John J. The Question of Albert Duerer's Religion....	110
Panama Canal, Through the West Indies to the—William S.	
Long	596
Papal Swiss Guards, The—Rev. Eustace Hampole, O. P...286,	369
Paraguay, A Word on Troubled—Rev. C. W. Currier, Ph. D..	193

	PAGE.
Parliament Restored in Altered Shape, The Irish—John J. O'Shea	332
Pole, Prince of the Church, Reginald—Walter F. Desterre	95, 227, 449
Pragmatism, The Metaphysics of—Rev. J. B. Ceulemans....	310
Property, Right to—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	22
Protestantism, The Beginnings of English—William F. Dennehy	7
Putumayo Atrocities, The—Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph.D.	658
Question of Albert Duerer's Religion, The—John J. O'Shea..	110
Quinn, Ph. D., Rev. Daniel—The Roman Name.....	439
Reginald Pole, Prince of the Church—Walter F. Desterre	95, 227, 449
Religion, The Question of Albert Duerer's—John J. O'Shea..	110
Revelation of the Monk of Evesham, The—F. M. Steele.....	32
Revolution, A Martyr of the French—B. de Courson.....	497
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John. Civism, Civility and Urbanity....	692
Rickaby, S. J. Rev. John. Right to Property.....	22
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John. The Obligation and the Sanction of the Moral Law	408
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. John. Thoughts Old and New About Justice	202
Right to Property, Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.....	22
Roman Name, The—Rev. Daniel Quinn, Ph. D.....	439
Royal Patroness of Learning, A—A. S. Bailey.....	612
Scotland, The Kail Glen Monks of—Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.	214
Scripture, The Inscriptions of Sinai and Their Relation to Certain Facts of—Rev. A. M. Skelly, O. P.....	678
Servia and the Balkan Crisis—R. F. O'Connor.....	561
Shakespeare in Spain—Rev. William Furlong, S. J.....	645
Sinai and Their Relation to Certain Facts of Scripture, The Inscriptions of—Rev. A. M. Skelly, O. P.....	678
Skelly, O. P., Rev. A. M. The Inscriptions of Sinai and Their Relation to Certain Facts of Scripture.....	678
Sobieska, Clementina—E. Cowell	667
Spain, Shakespeare in—Rev. William Furlong, S. J.....	645
State, Church and—Right Rev. Mgr. M. M. Hassett, D. D....	266
Steele, F. M. The Revelation of the Monk of Evesham.....	32
Swiss Guards, The Papal—Rev. Eustace Hampole, O. P..	286, 369
Thomas Dwight—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	60

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE.
Thoughts Old and New About Justice—Rev. John Rickaby, S. J.	202
Through the West Indies to the Panama Canal—William S. Long	596
van Amstel, O. P., Rev. Hildebrand—The Mariavites.....	49
Veto, The Lay—Rev. William J. Hegarty.....	410
Wage—An English View, The Living—E. C. Fortey	728
Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J. Thomas Dwight.....	60
Walsh, M. D. Montecassino—The Inner House of the Beautiful	521
Walsh, Thomas. The Manriques, Battle-Lords and Poets....	586
Were the "Articles Organiques" Part of the Concordat of 1801?—Rev. William J. Hegarty	718
Word on Troubled Paraguay, A—Rev. C. W. Currier, Ph. D..	193

BOOKS REVIEWED.

Agatha's Hard Saying—Mulholland	554
Back to the World—Champol	558
Bible Stories Told to Toddlers—Bosch	559
Breviarium Romanum—Benziger Brothers	757
Breviarium Romanum—B. Herder	760
Breviary, The Ratisbon Ideal	553
Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature, The.....	759
Catechist, The—Howe	180
Catholic Encyclopedia	186, 366, 745
Catholic Who's Who and Year Book, 1912.....	367
Christ's Teaching Concerning Divorce—Gigot	556
Christus—Huby	560
Concilium Tridentinum	750
Crux of Pastoral Medicine, The—Klarmann	189
Culture of the Soul—Ryan	366
Epitome e Graduali	191
Eucharistica—Henry	754
Eve of Catholic Emancipation, The—Ward.....	759
Father Lacombe—Hughes	182
Fool of God, The—Klarman	756
Friendship of Christ, The—Benson	559

	PAGE.
Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States	753
His Grey Eminence	755
Histoire de l'Inquisition en France—de Cauzons.....	367
History of Pope Boniface VIII. and His Times—Tosti.....	184
Homiletic and Catechetical Studies—Meyenberg	757
Innocent XI.—de Bojani	758
La vie meilleure par la priere—Badet	368
Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman—Ward	746
Life of St. Francis of Assisi—Cuthbert.....	752
Little Cardinal, The—Parr	755
Lives of the Friar Saints—Osmund & Jarrett.....	747
Mass, The—Fortescue	752
Miriam Lucas—Sheehan	748
New Psalter and Its Use—Burton & Myers.....	756
Other Sheep I Have	188
Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible—Seisenberger.	191
Price of Unity, The—Maturin	550
Primitive Catholicism—Battifol	185
Psalterium Romanum	560
Psychotherapy—Walsh	748
Round the World	558
Saint Francis of Assisi—Jorgensen	754
Science of Logic—Coffey	749
Social France in the Seventeenth Century—Hugon.....	190
Story of Cecilia, The—Hinkson.....	554
Studies	368
Summa Theologica of St. Thomas	760
Tempest of the Heart, The—Gray.....	554
Theodicy—Serbati	751
Through the Desert—Sienkiewicz	557
Wargrave Trust, The—Reid	554
Ways of Mental Prayer, The—Le Lodey.....	758
When Toddles Was Seven—Bosch	559

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII.—JANUARY, 1912—No. 145.

THE CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION IN CANADA.

THE defeat of the late Laurier Government in Canada after a tenure of office, with large majorities, of fifteen years (1896-1911), has been and is still being ascribed, by the unsuccessful party especially, to many and often to mutually inconsistent causes. So much is this the case, indeed, that any attempt, however impartial in purpose and intention, to account for it, resolves itself, to use a homely simile, into an exhibition of fancy skating on the thinnest of thin ice, a performance which is risky in proportion to its exhilaration—to the onlooker. The attendant perils are, in the present case, twofold; there is the danger not only of running counter to the political convictions of others, but also to their religious preconceptions. It has here been considered better, therefore, for sufficiently obvious reasons, to set down a chronicle of events, and of the inferences drawn from them by the one side and the other, rather than to give what must, at the best that can be said of it, be a personal and possibly biased account of a change which can only be described as being as momentous as it was, apparently, unexpected, certainly by those in power when it took place.

Written, however, as this article is, for a review wherein that which is of Catholic interest comes before all other conceivable considerations, national or political, the manner in which the change of government is likely to affect the welfare of the Church in Canada must, necessarily, hold first and most important place. Here also plainness and honesty of speech constitutes the chief risk referred to—that of running counter to the convictions and

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

preconceptions of others. It may amount, indeed, to giving unwitting and certainly unintentional offense; but the danger must, unfortunately, be incurred, if an accurate account of the matter is to be given.

Canada, on the eve of the election of September 21, stood, according to President Taft, "at the parting of the ways," and reciprocity was the last and most effectual alternative to imperial preference. The appeal to loyalty has since been condemned by the leader of the defeated party and by his American friends as an appeal to prejudice and to sentiment. Sentiment, however, plays as large a part in politics as in religion, and it must be admitted that a perfectly honest, even if mistaken, conviction that reciprocity was actually the first step on President Taft's path towards annexation did unquestionably influence a very large number of voters, not less on the Liberal than on the Conservative side.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, moreover, it may be respectfully suggested, is the last man who should condemn the influence of sentiment in politics, even where, as in the present instance, it has worked to his undoing. What other force, it may be asked, than nationalist sentiment has given him an unquestioned and overwhelming majority of votes in his own Province, in one election after another, and made a "solid Quebec" the arbiter of Canada's constitutional destiny for fifteen years?

But whether it were sentiment or prejudice which led thousands of Sir Wilfrid's followers to reject reciprocity; whether as the result of a "campaign of scandal" or of righteous indignation at extravagance, not to say dishonesty and mismanagement in government, a Liberal majority of forty was changed in one day to a Conservative majority equally great, and eight members of the Laurier Cabinet failed of reëlection at the polls.

In respect of what may be defined as religion in politics, religious prejudice has been credited, by the vanquished, at all events, with a large share in their defeat. Mr. Lemieux, the late Postmaster General, a French-Canadian and a Catholic, attributes it largely to the official attendance of the Laurier Cabinet—its Catholic members, that is—at the Eucharistic procession in Montreal last year, but not less—"tell it not in Gath"—to a certain famous sermon preached on that occasion by a distinguished English ecclesiastic. An Ontario member, on the other hand, who is endorsed by Mr. Oliver, the late Minister of the Interior, ascribes it to the publication of the *Ne Temere* decree, and the consequent fury of the Orange lodges.

To this extent, at all events, the Church appears to be involved in the issues of the election of September, 1911. That the causes

referred to were, in a measure, responsible for a certain number of votes cast against the Laurier Government there can, I honestly believe, be no doubt whatever. Anti-Catholic prejudice of a strenuous "early Victorian"—shall we say?—type is distinctly prevalent in Ontario. It was not lessened, as may be imagined, by the fact that a "French Papist," open to the obvious charge of "truckling to the Pope"—whatever that may mean—was at the head of the government of "a British and Protestant Dominion." Nor did the "hommages"—which is not homage, but something far more innocent—offered by the acting Governor, another "French Papist," to His Eminence Cardinal Vannutelli serve the cause of those who were held responsible for this "act of submission to Rome." In so far, therefore, as this prejudice must be taken into account, and it is by no means easy to define the limits or extent of its influence, the change of Premiership from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Borden, from a "French Papist," as aforesaid, to a "British Protestant," ought, it should seem, to be to the advantage of the Church in Canada. For Mr. Borden, though he will doubtless be compelled to "walk delicately," after the fashion of the late King Agag, does not come into office "suspect" on account of his name, his race or his creed.

Mr. Borden's Cabinet, like all that have preceded it, has made the inevitable concessions, in respect of its composition, to that sectionalism, racial, religious or local, which appears to be a dominant factor in Canadian politics, whether federal, provincial or municipal, to the extent of being regarded as a necessary evil. The Catholic portion of the community has, at all events, fully as adequate a representation in the present Conservative as in the late Liberal Administration, a fact which, taking the Church's temporal interests and welfare as of supreme moment to all her loyal children, cannot fail to be gratefully acknowledged as indicating the generous fairness of the new government of a Dominion wherein Catholics, numerous as they are, nevertheless constitute the minority. The reproach so freely made by their defeated opponents that it is "a coalition" of Tories and Nationalists, of Catholics and Orangemen, need not be taken seriously, unless as further evidence of impartiality, of a determination to deal justly and fairly with all the elements, racial and religious, which go to make up the growing Canadian nation.

Nor does the fact that the eternal school question, whether in Ontario or in Manitoba, bulks largely among the problems confronting the new Administration, render this compromise and counterbalance of diverse, but not necessarily antagonistic elements of any less, but rather of greater interest to Catholics, whether in

the Dominion itself, in the United States or in Great Britain. It is true that, to quote the *Conservative Gazette*, of Montreal, of November 24, "the trouble is not in the schools, but in the minds of the politicians who are trying to use them to catch narrow men's votes;" yet, unfortunately, politics may be defined as the *damnosa hereditas* of primary education, the *fons et origo* of most of its miseries, its failures and its difficulties. Now, the extension of the boundaries, said to be agreed upon, will most assuredly reopen the school question in that Province, for the simple reason that the majority of schools in the region to be annexed to Manitoba are French and Catholic.

To say that the question will be reopened is, indeed, hardly accurate, seeing that it has never been closed since the "great betrayal" of 1896, a betrayal laid, with all too great a measure of justice, to the charge of a French-Canadian and Catholic Premier; a betrayal, let it be added, said, with no little emphasis, by many of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's own people, to have been "avenged" on September 21 last. Here, again, the change of Premiership already referred to spells, or should spell, hope for Catholics; nor is the known piety of the new Prime Minister, his expressed resolve to do justice to all without weighty significance in this connection. Mr. Borden, to speak with all due respect and reserve, has the will and the power to set this question at rest, once for all, so far as any such settlement is possible, not by a fresh betrayal, but by the concession of those natural rights of which no man can deprive his neighbor with impunity.

"The American invasion" of the Prairie Provinces, as it has come to be designated, has a closer connection with the question of Catholic primary education than it might at first sight appear to have. When, therefore, a prominent Western Canadian, said to be in the Prime Minister's confidence, makes the control and supervision of immigration the thesis of a speech on "Canada and the Empire" before the Canadian Club, of Ottawa (November 25), this, again, is not without significance for Catholics generally. In no unneighborly spirit towards our friends to the south of us—it is, indeed, almost an insult to make such a protest—the gentleman referred to deprecates an indiscriminate or excessive American immigration into the newer west of Canada, as tending not only to a possible growth of an annexation movement, but also, which is far more serious and immediate import—whatever its political outcome—to "the triumph of mere materialism and of the Godless school." Let it be noted that the man who in a personal talk honored the present writer with the expression of the above conviction is an English-Canadian, and, I believe, a Methodist. He

will, I am sure, should he chance to read what is here written, acquit me of anything like a breach of confidence in here recording our conversation, in view of the supreme import of the issues involved.

To many Canadian Catholics, indeed, to those of French descent especially, the "American invasion" appears to present precisely the dangers here indicated, dangers which, they are convinced, would become intolerable realities should that invasion, by way of reciprocity, or of any other policy, ever lead to annexation. They are convinced, that is to say, that the "Americanizing" of the Canadian Northwest, that a policy of reciprocity does beyond doubt of question involve the ultimate political absorption of Canada in the United States. And, being so convinced, as they have a perfect right to be, holding, moreover, the other and infinitely more vital conviction that such absorption would be to the most serious detriment of the Church's interests, in the field of education especially, a breach of one of her innermost strongholds, is it any wonder that, East and West alike, they voted against a policy which seemed to threaten the dearest of all their interests—the faith of their little ones? Is it any wonder they should turn against an Administration which, as it must have appeared to them, was about to betray them again by setting their alleged material welfare above the real and eternal welfare of their souls and of the souls of their children?

Nor is this, as is so often asserted, the mere phantom of the Nationalist imagination, as is shown by the fact that a man not of their race or creed, who has spent the best years of his life in the Prairie Provinces, who went down to defeat in the last election because of his convictions, takes the same view of the matter. He may be said, indeed, to base his estimate of the true value of Canadian citizenship, his very imperialism, in the true sense of the word, upon this very fear of "materialism and the Godless school," points which he could not, of course, refer to, still less emphasize, in a public speech. And English Protestant as he is, he goes even farther in his desire that Canada should remain British; to the extent, it may be noted, of favoring a large French-Canadian immigration to the Prairie Provinces, not merely to offset "American" influences of the kind referred to, but chiefly in order that, by their loyalty to Christian and Catholic principles of primary education, they may counteract, if they cannot wholly banish, the evil influence of a system characterized by Manning as "heartless, headless and Godless." This, surely, is a Canadian nationalism, an imperialism with which no American Catholic can justly find fault.

The general policy of the new Administration, as foreshadowed in Mr. Borden's speech at Halifax, shortly after the election, appears to be one of closer imperial relations, while in no way lessening those which naturally bind Canada to the Great Republic to the south of her. It is a policy frequently spoken of and as frequently misspoken of as imperialism, but if the Canadian Club speech above alluded to may be taken as in any sense an interpretation of the Premier's policy in this respect, Americans, as has been shown, have no occasion to quarrel with it. The details must, of course, be left to Providence and to time; but the Dominion, having chosen a path other than that which Mr. Taft was so anxious she should walk in, appears, even humanly speaking, if I have faithfully chronicled events and inferences, to have selected an efficient guide and leader, as far above the suspicion of bias or partiality, national or religious, as it is possible for the leader of a political party to be. This imperial policy, moreover, while it does not directly, perhaps not even remotely, affect the interests of the Church in Canada, is none the less her concern, as the mistress and divinely commissioned teacher of loyalty to constituted authority, "whether to the King as supreme, or unto Governors," Presidents or Premiers.

Mr. Borden is also credited with favoring a policy of national ownership or control of public utilities. Here, again, time will show the wisdom or the possibility of its accomplishment; it has, of course, an interest even more remote, so far as the Church is concerned, than his imperialism or his commercial policy. It is to matters which immediately concern the Church's welfare, in the domain of education especially, that attention has chiefly been paid in the foregoing pages. If, therefore, there is even the appearance of bias, in so much as a single word or sentence, it will, I trust, be set down to my inability—if I may venture so to speak of it and myself—to regard any question, social, national or political, otherwise than as it may or may not affect the supreme and most vital of all possible or conceivable interests—for a Catholic—the interests and welfare of God's Holy Catholic Church. That, I take it, is the true import of our Holy Father's motto: *In omnibus Glorificetur Deus*; and while the Catholic, like the Church to which he belongs, has in a very real sense and should have no party affiliations such as bind other men, he can and may most legitimately express his preference for the party or the policy which, he honestly believes, is most likely to advance the Church's best interests at any time or in any country.

It is in this sense, therefore, and under these convictions that I have, as I venture to hope, written what is here offered to the

kindly consideration of American Catholics. It is in this sense and under this conviction that holding, as I do, that the Laurier Government betrayed the cause of the Catholic schools in Manitoba in 1896; that a French and Catholic Premier had, in consequence of certain inter-provincial, inter-racial, political and religious conditions, become a hindrance to the Church's work in Canada, I am honestly persuaded that the election of September 21, 1911, was but another evidence to princes, politicians and to peoples that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." I am persuaded, further, that the Laurier Government, having misused its power and its opportunities, was deprived of both by God's Providence; that the kingdom has been given, by God's Providence, into other hands, has been entrusted to men who, there is every reason and hope to believe, will prove worthy of it.

O. S. B.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM.¹

SOMERSET and his colleagues were bent on creating a new "Parliament-made Religion." Lollardism was at last to be legalized and every effort to be made to get rid of the last vestige of pretense that there was anything spiritual in the composition or constitution of the Reformed Church of England. This revolution could not be achieved in a day, but as little time as possible was to be lost in bringing it to a conclusion. Accordingly, on the 13th of November, 1547, a bill was introduced to enable "the admission of Bishops by the King's Majesty only." This measure was committed to Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury, for revision, and having been dealt with by him, was read a second time on the 16th, when it was submitted to a more formal committee, composed of Bishops Tunstall² and Thirlby, the Lord

¹ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," by James Gardiner, LL.D., Vol. III. London, Macmillan & Co., Limited.

² Cuthbert Tunstall, born at Hackforth, in Yorkshire, in 1474, and brother of Sir Brian Tunstall, who fell at Flodden. The Christian name of the latter indicates a strain of Irish ancestry. He was educated at Oxford, Cambridge and Padua. After holding a number of other important offices, he became Bishop of London in 1522 and Bishop of Durham in 1530. He was a man of much ability and of great courtliness of demeanor, which recommended him for repeated employment as an ambassador to foreign sovereigns. In 1516 he was sent on an embassy to Charles V. at Brussels, where he formed an intimate friendship with Erasmus. In 1527 he was Wolsey's companion in the Cardinal's famous and magnificent embassy to France. Unfortunately, like Gardiner, he accepted the royal supremacy and rejected Papal authority, but also, like that prelate, refused to accept

Chief Baron and the King's Attorney General. It was read a third time on the 28th of November. On the 3d of December another measure was brought forward for regulating the election of Bishops, but although it received a second reading on the 5th, was eventually dropped in favor of one legalizing the making of Bishops by royal letters patent, without the issuing of any "cong   d'  lire," or leave to elect. This might still be issued, but would only be when it was quite certain that it would be regarded as a mere formality, as at present. This "cong   d'  lire" is now regularly granted to the cathedral chapters of vacant sees, after the Prime Minister has selected a new prelate and the sovereign has actually appointed him. The so-called "election" consists merely of a registration of the royal decree of appointment. The selection of the Bishop is generally the result of judicious party or political wire-pulling in either ministerial or court circles; sometimes partly in both. At the time, however, when this system was devised, Somerset and his fellow-conspirators were gravely concerned as to what might happen to it and other portions of their legislation if Edward VI. should reach the age of twenty-four years, when, under the provisions of the Act 28, Henry VIII., cap. 17, which his masterful father had caused to be passed, he would be entitled to repeal any or all of the Acts of Parliament passed during his minority by issuing letters patent to that effect. So long as this law remained on the Statute Book there would always be inducement offered to faithful Catholics to hope and strive, at a future date, for the annulment of their impious laws, with perhaps serious consequences for themselves. Unfortunately, however, they experienced less difficulty than they expected in getting Parliament to repeal Henry's law. It was got rid of speedily enough.

The next step accomplished was the enactment of a lengthy statute, strongly opposed in both Houses, directed to securing the complete confiscation of all endowments conferred by the pious dead of the past on chantries, brotherhoods and colleges for the maintenance of priests to say Masses for the souls of the testators or for those of their relatives or other beneficiaries. Professor Gairdner leaves his readers under no mistaken impression as to the real purposes of this statute, regarding which grossly false

the further innovations introduced in the reign of Edward VI. In 1552 he was deprived of his see, but was restored thereto on the accession of Mary, and it is recorded of him that under his rule not a single heretic suffered capital punishment. On the accession of Elizabeth he refused to recommit his old fault, and accordingly rejected the oath of supremacy. He was again deprived on the 29th September, 1559, and about six weeks afterwards died at the house of Archbishop Parker, who, although a pervert, seems to have remained a friend of his.

pretenses were resorted to. He says: "These foundations had already been dissolved by an Act of the last Parliament of Henry VIII.; but that Act had only taken partial effect, and a more thorough measure was required for the relief of an embarrassed treasury. The pretense, indeed, was to divert funds from superstitious uses and apply them to the erection of grammar schools, augmentation of the universities and relief of the poor. But the 'Acts of the Privy Council' speak without disguise as to the real object. For on the 17th of April, 1548, four months after this Act was passed, commissions were issued under it for the sale of chantry lands, the minutes of Council declaring that they were granted 'specially for the relief of the King's Majesty's charges and expenses, which do daily grow and increase by reason of divers and sundry fortifications, garrisons, levying of men and soldiers,' etc. And it is further stated that 'the King's most loving subjects were induced the rather and franklier to grant those said colleges and free chapels, chantries and other things . . . that they might thereby be relieved of the continual charge of taxes, contributions, loans and subsidies.' This is extremely candid as explaining the influences which carried the Act through Parliament. But the motive expressed in the preamble to the Act itself was 'considering that a great part of superstition and errors in Christian religion has been brought into the minds and estimations of men by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ, and by devising and phantasing vain opinions of Purgatory and Masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed,' etc. Thus Parliament, inspired by such motives as the Council so frankly declared afterwards, invoked theology in aid of the Act of Confiscation."³ This theology, be it noted, was utterly erroneous even so far as the Church then still existing was concerned, for its ministers were at the time yet offering the "Masses satisfactory" for the repose of the soul of Henry VIII., for which he had left bequests. Somerset, therefore, induced Parliament, in this measure, to make a pronouncement in favor of a change in the national religion which it seems reasonable to assume the late King never would have sanctioned. The Act was not passed without encountering much opposition. Even Cranmer opposed it—not because he desired to preserve the Mass, but because he wanted to have the endowments applied to educational purposes or the relief of the poorer clergy.

Matters generally were, however, moving rapidly towards the "Reformation" of religion, and on the 17th of December the wretched Convocation passed a resolution demanding the repeal

³ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., p. 56.

of all laws and canons prohibitory of the marriage of the clergy. This resolution was not passed without much opposition and was only carried by the pressure exercised by Somerset, who was influenced by Cranmer. Mr. Gairdner frankly says that "it is to be feared that contemporaries did not look upon it so much in the light of a reform as of a kind of legitimizing of women hitherto in an ambiguous position. Indeed, the prejudice against them remained long after. Queen Elizabeth's objection to a married clergy is well known; and it must be said that there were clerical and even episcopal wives in her time whose characters were painfully notorious."⁴ Convocation having thus done its part of the evil work, there was comparatively little difficulty in inducing Parliament in the following year to accept a Bill providing "that lay and married men may be priests and have benefices." Those who would argue in favor of the "continuity" theory and the validity of Anglican Orders conveniently ignore this statute. Parliament was prorogued on Christmas Eve, and Somerset and Cranmer had an interval wherein to legislate, as they were fond of doing, by Proclamation. These worthies were mightily concerned for the preservation of respect for the Blessed Sacrament. One of the first of their edicts was issued on the 27th of December. It purported to explain the Sacrament in a fashion different from that laid down in the existing Act of Parliament. Mr. Gairdner writes: "The King, it was said, had made a good and godly Act against contemnners of the Sacrament; yet some of his subjects, as he was informed, 'not contented with such words and terms as Scripture doth declare thereof, nor with that doctrine which the Holy Ghost by the Evangelists of St. Paul had taught us,' still raised 'contentions and superfluous questions' about it, entering rashly into high mysteries in their sermons and conversation with irreverent inquiries whether the body and blood of Christ was there, 'really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptly, and having quantity and greatness, or but substantially and by substance only, or else but in a figure and manner of speaking; whether His blessed body be there, head, legs, arms, toes and nails, or any other ways, shape or manner, naked or clothed; whether He is broken or chewed, or He is always whole; whether the bread there remaineth as we see, or how it departeth; whether the flesh be there alone, and the blood, or part, or each in other, or in the one both, in the other but only blood. And what blood? That only which did flow out of the side, or that which remained? With other such irreverent, superfluous and curious questions,' aiming at things 'to which our human imbecility cannot attain.' The King,

⁴ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III, p. 58.

therefore, by advice of the Protector and Council, commanded that no one should henceforth openly argue on such questions, 'affirming any more terms of the said blessed Sacrament than be expressly taught in the Holy Scripture and mentioned in the fore-said Act, nor deny none that be therein contained and mentioned until such time as the King's Majesty, by the advice of His Highness' Council and the clergy of this realm, shall define, declare and set forth an open doctrine thereof, and what terms and words may justly be spoken thereby, other than be expressly in the Scripture contained in the Act before rehearsed.' Meanwhile good subjects were to 'devoutly and reverently affirm and take that holy bread to be Christ's body and that cup to be the cup of His holy blood, according to the purport and effect of the Holy Scripture contained in the Act before expressed.' Yet the King did not wish to discourage those ignorant and willing to learn from inquiring further on the subject from those whom he considered qualified to teach. But contentious debaters, who called the Sacrament an idol, or by any such vile name, would incur the King's indignation and suffer imprisonment."⁵ Meantime the royal visitors, among whom was Ridley,⁶ in London and throughout the provinces were vigorously engaged in pulling down the crucifixes and images of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, these being generally "given to the boys to be broken." The Church was being "reformed" with a vengeance!

On the 27th of January, 1548, Cranmer informed Bishop Bonner that "my Lord Protector's Grace, with the advice of the King's Majesty's Council, for certain considerations them thereunto mov-

⁵ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 59, 60.

⁶ Nicholas Ridley, born about 1500, in Northumberland. He received his first education at a grammar school in Newcastle-on-Tyne, when he proceeded to Cambridge, becoming fellow and master of that university. Here he became tainted with the heretical doctrines which had already been preached at Cambridge by Tyndale and Blinney, whose theories had also corrupted Cranmer and Latimer. Proceeding to the continent, Ridley became still more imbued with unorthodox principles, and on his return to England became a useful tool of the conspirators who were resolved on subverting the ancient faith. He became domestic chaplain to Cranmer, in his office as Archbishop of Canterbury, and was soon made Bishop of Rochester. When Bonner was deprived of the See of London, in 1550, Ridley succeeded him, and thenceforth was an active supporter of the new religion. In 1552 he visited the Princess Mary at Hunsdon, and sought to browbeat her into abandoning Catholicity. He, however, received quite as much as he gave, and had to retire discomfited. On the death of Edward VI. he declared for Lady Jane Grey, and at St. Paul's Cross proclaimed both Mary and Elizabeth to be illegitimate. As soon, however, as Mary was proclaimed Queen he hastened to court at Framlingham, but naturally he was received with scant courtesy, his treason being known to all men. He was speedily arrested and sent to the Tower. Eventually, with Latimer, he was burned to death at Oxford, on the 16th October, 1555.

ing," had resolved that no candles should be borne on Candlemas Day, nor ashes nor palms used henceforth any longer. And this he was to cause to be notified in all parish churches, and to other Bishops that they might do the like; so that the change might be complete by Ash Wednesday. On the 21st of February a mandate was issued by Somerset to the Bishops as a whole requiring the removal from all the churches of every image whatsoever; not one was to be spared, however venerable or revered. "Next came out, on the 8th of March, 'an Order of Communion' prefaced by a royal proclamation to give it validity. This was natural, as Communion in both kinds had been agreed to both by Convocation and Parliament; and it was, of course, right to have the form authorized and ready for use before Easter Sunday, which was the 1st of April. The new ritual was contained in a pamphlet of ten leaves; and it really was hardly so much a change as an addition to the existing service. The Latin Mass was to go on as before, without any variation except that when the laity were to communicate, the celebrant was not to drink up all the wine he consecrated, and the 'Order' was simply an English form for administering to them after the priest's Mass. It contained, however, some prefatory exhortations and a general confession to be used by the congregation to obviate the necessity of private confession and shrift for those who preferred to do without them." Gardiner and his time-serving colleagues, who had sought to save the Sacraments of the Church by betraying the Papacy, had indeed bitter reason to rue the folly of their opportunism. As for him, he was brought, on the 8th of January, out of the Fleet Prison into the presence of the Lord Protector and Council, when he was informed that his previous offenses were remitted by the General Pardon, or amnesty, which had lately been voted by Parliament. Having been soundly rated for his past contumacy and told that he was now released from captivity, he was asked if he would conform now to the injunctions and homilies, "and such other doctrine as should be set forth from time to time by the King's Highness and clergy of this realm, articles of part whereof, touching Justification, were then exhibited to him to declare in the same his opinion." These are the words in which the story can still be read in the records of the Privy Council. Thus cornered, Gardiner declared that he would act in accordance with the other Bishops, but that, as regards the particular article upon which he was specially challenged, he should like to have four or five days within which to consider his answer. This was granted, but when he came to make reply it fell short of what the Council wanted, and

¹ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III, p. 62.

he was ordered to remain within his own house. In a little time he was notified that he might return to his diocese, but it was not long before complaint was made in London that he was not nearly as zealous therein for the new order of things as he should be. Whereupon he was brought back to the metropolis and ordered to preach before the King, in order to make his position clear. This he did, but while doing his best to avoid offense, he made it plain that he had no intention of abandoning any of the sacramental doctrines of the Catholic Church. He was promptly re-arrested and confined in the Tower, where he remained until released on the accession of Queen Mary.

Professor Gairdner devotes a great deal of space to critical analysis of Cranmer's mind on the questions of Transubstantiation and of the Real Presence in the Most Holy Sacrament. When all has been said that can be said, the outstanding fact remaining is that, so long as Henry VIII. was alive the Archbishop of Canterbury, no matter what his personal belief really was, did not dare to admit that he rejected the teaching of the Church. If he had, Henry would have dealt with him precisely as with Anne Askew, Lambert and several others whom he promptly consigned to the stake for their heretical opinions on the subject. Mr. Gairdner points out that he had abundant grounds for prudence: "To deny Transubstantiation was death under the Six Articles; and in the Book of 1543 the doctrine was very expressly laid down by the King's authority. How the Primate of All England could have retained his own Lutheran theology after these dates may very well seem astonishing. In point of fact, he apparently did not, but this does not make his position less extraordinary; for, from what we hear, he does not seem to have kept up even to the Lutheran standard."⁸ So far back as 1543 he had shocked his own prebendaries by a lecture on the Sacrament of the Altar, in which he described It as "but a similitude." His opinions were, therefore, pretty well known, but he never opened his lips or lifted a hand in defense of those whom Henry burned for holding similar views. He maintained an attitude of nearly complete reticence on the question for close on two years after Henry's death. "Under Edward VI., when the Act of the Six Articles was repealed, he was for some time still held to be a Lutheran, and disappointed the expectation of the more ardent Reformers in England by his reticence on this great subject. But he was moving cautiously and preparing to avow a change of opinion which, as we learn from himself, was the result of conferences with his chaplain Ridley, the future Bishop. At a time which, as it has been shown with

⁸ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 75, 76.

almost definite certitude, must lie between the narrow limits of the end of December, 1547, and the beginning of February, 1548, he submitted three sets of questions concerning the Mass to the Bishops of both provinces (or the greater number of them), and to at least two divines besides, whose answers enabled him to see the amount of sympathy that he might expect in the policy which he had now in view, of changing the Mass into a Communion service. Reception by the laity in both kinds had already been authorized, and 'the Order of Communion' came out on the 8th of March, 1548."⁹ On the 14th of December, 1547, in a debate in the House of Lords he publicly proclaimed his rejection of the Catholic belief in Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. His action was supported by Ridley, now King's Bishop of Rochester, who, according to the testimony of a heretical observer, Traheron, "handled the subject with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition and power as to stop the mouth of that most zealous Papist, the Bishop of Worcester—Heath." Traheron adds: "The foolish Bishops have made a marvelous recantation." With reference to all this, Dr. Gairdner says: "That Cranmer's declaration in the end of the year 1548 really tended to silence discord among Bishops and clergymen may be true. It was unquestionably favorable to the noisy party, and the opposite school were bound to show some respect for an Archbishop, however much they differed from him. But it was certainly high time to do something, not only to remedy disorder, but, if possible, to get rid of its causes. In a contemporary chronicle we read as follows:

"'At this time was much preaching through all England against the Sacrament of the Altar, save only Mr. Laygton, and he preached, in every place that he preached, against them all. And so was much controversy and much business in Paul's every Sunday, and fighting in the church, and of none that were honest persons, but boys and persons of little reputation; and would have made much more if there had not a way been taken. And at the last, the 28th day of September following, there was a proclamation that none of both parties should preach unto such time as the Council had determined such things as they were in hand withal; for at that time divers of the Bishops sat at Chertsey Abbey for divers matters of the King and the Council.'"¹⁰

Parliament was twice prorogued in 1548, after two brief sittings, held merely in order to vote supplies, but was called together again on the 24th of November of that year.

The sitting was destined to be a momentous one. The Bishops

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹⁰ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., p. 80.

and other divines who had been meeting, deliberating and disputing, first at Chertsey and secondly at Windsor, relative to the production of a new manual of public worship had—by a majority—compiled a Prayer Book satisfactory to Somerset, to Cranmer and Edward VI. This was laid before the House of Lords on the 14th of December, 1548. It created sharp conflict, as well it might. "Bishop Tunstall objected that 'the adoration was left out of the book.' Those who drew it up, he said, considered that there was nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine. His speech drew forth comments from Cranmer and from Heath, of Worcester; and at the end of the day Bishop Thirlby made a rather disconcerting remark that the book, as touching the doctrine of the Supper, was not agreed upon among the Bishops, but was only in disputation. The Protector next day endeavored to make out that the doctrine had been settled by a majority of votes; but Thirlby replied that things were not agreed upon till they were conceded. It was a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms, and as this had not been done he could not agree to the doctrine. The Protector was seriously put out, and said Thirlby's words implied wilfulness and obstinacy. But Bonner brought a far more serious battery to bear. The doctrine of the proposed Prayer Book, he said, was not decent, because it had been condemned as heresy, not only abroad, but in England also, in the case of Lambert; and, proceeding further to show how the book countenanced heresy, he provoked Somerset more than ever. But it is needless to go into the whole controversy. The discussion lasted five days, and was closed by Cranmer on Wednesday, 19th of December, when the book was sent down to the Commons, who at once returned it. The bill to authorize the new Prayer Book passed finally through the Lords in January, 1549, when ten Bishops voted for it and eight against. In the Commons it passed its third reading on the 21st, and it was to become operative from Whitsunday following. The measure thus became law, and is commonly known as the First Act of Uniformity."¹¹ Meantime the general concerns of the country were in a parlous state. On the 17th of March, 1549, Somerset was successful in securing the execution for high treason of his more able, but equally unscrupulous brother Thomas, Lord Seymour, Lord High Admiral of England, husband of the Queen Dowager, Catherine, and guilty lover of the Princess Elizabeth, afterwards the "Virgin Queen." Seymour, however, was not executed for his immoralities, of which the Reformers thought little, but because Somerset and Cranmer believed that he was conspiring against them, seeking to release the King from their

¹¹ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 83, 84.

control and tutelage, in order to place him within his own.¹² A tremendous war was being waged with Scotland, mainly with a view to securing the hand of its young Queen, Mary, for Edward and, of course, her eventual Protestantizing. All interest in this costly conflict ended when Mary was enabled to escape to France and was married to the Dauphin. Terrible distress existed amongst the people, agriculture was at the lowest ebb, the currency was depressed and the general condition of the masses deplorable in the last degree. On top of these calamities came risings in several of the principal counties of the kingdom, which were only suppressed by the employment of large bodies of foreign troops, mercenaries imported from Italy, Spain and Germany, for the purposes of the war against Scotland. Order was temporarily restored by dint of many atrocities, but a still more serious insurrection, mainly produced by the religious changes, under the leadership, in Devonshire, of Humphrey Arundel, and, in Norfolk, of Ket the tanner,¹³ soon occupied the attention of the Government and all the available forces of the town for a long time. Peace was restored at last, but Somerset's prestige had vanished and the hour of his downfall was at hand. Before and throughout the disturbances the Princess Mary was fighting a splendid battle in defense of her own liberty of conscience and against the religious innovations, so far as a poor lone woman, virtually in captivity, could.

Describing what occurred, Professor Gairdner says: "Before these disturbances the forward policy in religion had met with a serious obstacle in one important quarter. The Princess, or, as she was officially called, the Lady Mary, continued her Mass and ignored the new Prayer Book and Order of Communion altogether. It was difficult to pass this over, as it would naturally encourage others. On Sunday, the 16th of June, 1549, as appears by the Acts of the Privy Council, the Lords wrote to her, 'giving to her advice to be conformable and obedient to the observation of His Majesty's laws, to give order that the Mass should be no more used in her house, that she would embrace and cause to be celebrate in her said house the Communion and other divine services set forth by His Majesty, and that Her Grace would send to the said Lord Protector and Council her Comptroller and Dr.

¹² Lingard's "History of England," edition of 1825, Vol. VII., p. 43, et supra.

¹³ Robert Ket, a tanner of Wymondham, who raised the standard of rebellion, as stated above. He was a wealthy landowner as well as tanner. Sixteen thousand men assembled at his call in the vicinity of Norwich, which he captured twice, holding it after the second occupation until it was finally recovered for the king by the Earl of Warwick. In a battle which ensued Ket's forces were finally routed and he was taken prisoner. Eventually he was hanged in Norwich.

Hopton, her chaplain, by whom Her Grace should be advertised from their Lordships more amply of their minds, to both her contentation and honor.' Mary was at this time at Kenninghall, in Norfolk, from which place she answered them six days later." In this reply she positively refused to make any alteration in her devotional exercises or to recognize any ritual other than that which existed at the time of her father's death and roundly censured all who had anything to do with the introduction of alterations during the minority of her brother, "to the displeasure of God and unquietedness of the realm." Moreover, she declined to send either her chaplain or Comptroller to London, on the ground that the first was ill and that she could not do without the services of the other in the management of her household and the administration of her finances. The letter was a dignified one and made plain that the courageous Princess was determined to uphold her royal prerogatives. The Privy Council, however, were determined not to be balked in their purpose, and accordingly issued personal summonses to the chaplain, the Comptroller and another of her suite, a Mr. Englefield, to attend before them. These officials could not, of course, plead any privilege, and Mary, in order to save them from the peril of disobedience, ordered them to comply with the mandates served on them. It appears that the Comptroller was almost immediately allowed to return to Norfolk, but the chaplain, Dr. Hopton, was detained from the 27th of June to the 7th of July (1549), when he was sent back with a number of memoranda denying the correctness of many statements in Mary's letter. For instance, in this she had boldly and rightly asserted that "the law made by Parliament is not worthy the name of law," meaning thereby the statute substituting a Communion service for the Mass. It was pointed out that no subject had a right to question the validity of a law approved by the King and enacted after "long study, free disputation and by the uniform determination of the whole clergy consulted, debated and concluded," while no person had less right to deny its authority than the King's sister, who was in special degree bound to respect the royal authority.

Referring to this pettifogging point, Professor Gairdner quite rightly says: "Of course, the contention of the Council was indisputable, that one law can repeal another law; but still the question of authority remained. That statute law could regulate religion at all was an idea which had never been entertained before the preceding reign; yet, if it could at other times, it was felt that, during a minority at least, so high a matter ought not to be further disturbed. For when special precautions had been taken to guard against serious innovations even by Parliament, till the

King should be fully twenty-four years old, how could he be thought competent now in his twelfth year to discharge adequately the extraordinary functions of a 'Supreme Head' of the Church of England? If anything in Mary's letter was really open to question, it was the assertion that her father's laws were agreed to 'without compulsion by the whole realm.' That was certainly not the case, but it was a statement which it hardly became the Council to challenge." Of course, the only fragment of basis for the Council's argument was provided by Henry's statute of the Six Articles, which profanely accorded to the Sacraments of God's Church the sanction and protection of the same Parliament which had rejected the jurisdiction of the Holy See and proclaimed the King its head. Mary's defense of her position was undoubtedly impaired, viewed from a Catholic aspect, by her reliance on that measure, instead of solely on the ancient practices, principles and laws of the Church; but she wanted to make the other point that Somerset and his colleagues had solemnly sworn to maintain the statute, which they had since torn into shreds. She was, however, fighting a splendid battle with comparatively little help. Even while she fought she knew that her life, so to say, hung upon a hair. She was contending with men who would not have hesitated to consign her to the darkest dungeon in the Tower, to death upon the scaffold, by the dagger or by poison. Her strong faith and inherited Tudor courage sustained her in a terrible conflict.

Only a brave heart—one devoid of fear—could have enabled her to face her persecutors, to answer their upbraidings as she did, not them, and to censure their proceedings as if she had cohorts note them and to censure their proceedings as if she had cohorts of soldiers to enforce her will. On the 2d of July she wrote, in part, to the Council as follows:

"It is no small grief to me to perceive that they whom the King's Majesty, my father (whose soul God pardon), made in this world of nothing in respect of that they be come to now, and at his last end put in trust to see his will performed, whereunto they were all sworn upon a book—it grieveth me, I say, for the love I bear to them, to see both how they break his will and what usurped power they take upon them in making (as they call it) laws, both clean contrary to his proceedings and will, and also against the custom of all Christendom and (in my conscience) against the law of God and His Church, which passeth all the rest. But though you among you have forgotten the King, my father, yet both God's commandment and nature will not suffer me to do so. Wherefore, with God's help, I will remain an obedient child to his laws as he left them, till such time as the King's Majesty, my brother, shall

have perfect years of discretion to order the power that God hath sent him, and to be a judge in these matters himself; and I doubt not but he shall then accept my so doing better than theirs which have taken a piece of his power upon them in his minority.

"I do not a little marvel that you can find fault with me for observing of that law which was allowed by him that was a King, not only of power, but also of knowledge how to order his power—to which law all you consented, and seemed at that time, to the outward appearance, very well to like the same—and that you could find no fault all this while with some amongst yourselves for running half a year before that which you now call a law—yea, and before the Bishops came together; wherein, methinketh, you do me very much wrong if I should not have as much preëminence to continue in keeping a full authorized law made without partiality, as they had both to break the law which at that time, yourselves must needs confess, was of full power and strength, and to use alterations of their own invention."

There is no doubt that the boldness of Mary's attitude actually frightened the Protector and the Council. They realized the danger of pushing matters to extremes with the heroic and strong-willed Princess. In his reply the Protector made statements regarding Henry VIII. which—if well founded—are sufficient to seriously discredit the sincerity of his Catholic declarations in the famous will. Somerset wrote to Mary: "Did not His Grace also depart from this life before he had finished such godly orders as he minded to have established to all his people if death hath not prevented him? Is it not most true that no kind of religion was permitted at his death, but left all uncertain, most like to have brought us in parties and divisions if God had not helped us? And doth your Grace think it convenient it should so remain? God forbid! What regret and sorrow our late master had the time he saw he must depart, for that he knew the religion was not established as he purposed to have done, I and others can be witness and testify." The Princess, however, held on steadfastly to her determination to retain the ancient devotions and practices of the Church and, through sheer fear of another popular uprising if she were coerced, a Royal dispensation was issued relieving her for the time from obligation to obey the new religious ordinances.

All this time Gardiner was in prison, and even Bonner¹⁴ was

¹⁴ Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, was born about 1500. He gained a high reputation by his knowledge of canon law while still a student at Oxford, and as soon as ordained was singled out by Wolsey, who made him one of his chaplains for promotion, and also bestowed on him several benefices. After Wolsey's fall Bonner distinguished himself by his support of Henry VIII., and even argued his cause with such vehemence before

there also. As Professor Gairdner remarks: "His submission to the royal visitation had been somewhat forced; but, apparently, it had been perfectly loyal, and he had even complied with orders affecting ritual which could scarcely have agreed with his own judgment. Nevertheless, the Council addressed to him a letter on the 2d of August, telling him that through his evil example and his slackness in preaching and instructing the people, they absented themselves from prayer and the Holy Communion. They frequented foreign rites and Masses such as were not allowed by the orders of the realm. Moreover, adultery and fornication abounded. The Bishop had been admonished of these things, but had made no redress. They therefore peremptorily commanded him to reform that neglect; and they also required him to preach a sermon at St. Paul's against the sin of rebellion, the heads of which sermon they prescribed for him, adding some further directions in consequence of the defeat of the rebels. He accordingly preached at Paul's Cross on the 1st of September, and apparently meant to do this duty, even as regards the Government. He did declare in his sermon the unlawfulness of rebellion, but he was no less anxious to set forth that old sacramental doctrine in which he still believed, and which he felt was now being imperiled by irreverence and fanaticism. He perhaps did not like to be dictated to as to the exact line that he should take, but he honestly tried to do all that he was asked to do, especially in declaring the sinfulness of rebellion."¹⁵ Unfortunately for himself, he omitted to lay stress on one of the articles, to the effect that the King possessed as full authority in matters of religion while still a minor as if he had attained his majority. This was regarded as evidencing treasonable intention, and he was committed to the Marshalsea.

the Pope at Marseilles that, it is alleged, he deemed it prudent to fly secretly from that city. In 1540 he was made Bishop of London, and assisted the King in securing the condemnation and execution of several Protestants, like Anne Askew, who denied the Real Presence of our Lord in the Most Holy Sacrament. Like Gardiner, he was opposed to the religious changes introduced during the minority of Edward VI., and was, as stated above, imprisoned and deprived of his see in 1550. On the accession of Mary, in 1553, he was restored to liberty and resumed possession of his see. He appears to have taken an active part in the harsh proceedings then instituted against those whose tendencies were revolutionary in the matter of religion. On the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, he was, in consequence, marked out for the displeasure of that infamous woman, and when he came with the other Bishops to render homage she refused to allow him to kiss her hand. In May, 1559, he was summoned before the Privy Council to take the oath of supremacy, acknowledging the Queen as head of the Church. He nobly refused to do so, and Elizabeth deposed him from his episcopal chair and imprisoned him in the Marshalsea, where he died, after much suffering, in 1569.

¹⁵ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 101.

Ere long he was followed to prison by Somerset himself. Dr. Gairdner tells the story of the latter's fall in the following words: "Although the Council had agreed from the very first that Somerset should be Protector, and had even put him over their own heads more unreservedly by the commission of the 12th of March, 1547, dislike of his ascendancy must certainly have been growing. Just before his Scottish campaign he obtained, under date of August 11, a commission as the King's Lieutenant and Captain General of wars both by land and sea; and, of course, his victory at Pinkie Cleuch in September covered him with glory. At the opening of Parliament in November following, a special place was assigned to him by writ of Privy Seal, where he should always sit apart, whether the King was present or not, and he was given all the privileges ever enjoyed by any previous Protector during a minority, notwithstanding a statute of 31 Hen. VIII. about the placing of the Lords in the Parliament Chamber. He was then at the height of his power. Yet at the end of that session on Christmas Eve, he was persuaded to surrender those two patents of March 12 and August 11 for a fuller grant from the Crown which was witnessed by the signatures, both of King Edward himself at the head, and of all the Lords present in Parliament that day. In this document he is appointed 'to be our chief and principal counsellor, and chiefest and highest of our Privy Council;' and, for the rest, it was almost in every point an ample confirmation of the contents of the two patents surrendered. But there was one important exception. The office of Protector was not to be held absolutely during the whole time of the minority, but was by this grant to be terminable at the King's pleasure. So a well-concerted cabal could easily unseat him at any time. Now the kingdom had been seriously weakened by the many rebellions in different places, and was further threatened by a foreign enemy. At the very time when the Norfolk rebellion was at its height the French had taken and fortified Sark, and the French King himself was in the field with an army which took several places near Boulogne, and seemed in a fair way to recover that much-prized conquest of Henry VIII. Then the Earl of Warwick, having subdued the Norfolk rebels, came up to London, where many of the Council, disaffected towards the Protector's government, had withdrawn from Court. He held a consultation with them at Ely Place, Holborn. They proclaimed Somerset a traitor on the 8th of October, and by the 14th had him separated from the King and lodged him in the Tower. Articles were drawn up accusing him of manifold offenses, which he confessed to save his life. The Protectorate was at an end, and a new government was to take

its place."¹⁶ At this point we may lay down Professor Gairdner's fascinating work, with the expression of the hope that its veteran and impartial author may be enabled to bring to full accomplishment the great service to the cause of historic truth he is endeavoring to render.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

RIGHT TO PROPERTY.

PRIVATE PROPERTY.

IF WE take a small tribe of about one thousand persons, living a life more or less nomadic, with little or nothing in the way of agriculture or of domesticated cattle, or of trade; but supported mostly by fishing, hunting and a spontaneously offered vegetation, then in such a people property, both common and private, to some extent would exist; yet in a very small degree, especially what was private. Among personal belongings would be a rude clothing, and perhaps some equally rude ornaments, for love of adornments seems aboriginal; a few tools and a few articles serving as toys or curiosities. But the property we here want to consider is that which involves a large and permanent ownership, such as exists in our complex civilization, as to which it is a conclusion firmly fixed for every well-examining mind that some things must be of public ownership as the possessions of the State, or of the municipality, or of the village Council, or of the patriarchal authority, while other things must be private either to families or to individuals. It is the private possession which we are going to examine.

Upon it we may premise these few remarks that its proportion to public property cannot be a fixed ratio, but will vary very much indeed with times and circumstances and the accidents of history; that no method will be free from the liability of very grave abuse, so long as mankind at large is so far from perfection as it has hitherto been; that absolute equality in possessions all round is a dream quite beyond realization, and in some respects beyond desirability, since such a dead level has no analogy in the effective conduct of human affairs.

The leading reasons for the admission of private property, held in stable possession, were mentioned by Aristotle, from whom St.

¹⁶ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 105.

Thomas has adopted them as valid. The Greek philosopher (Polit. II., 5), leaving out or combating Plato's reasons for a community of wives and property in the ruling class, argues that possessions held in common would lead to dissensions about produce or profit; that the stimulus and the sense of enjoyment in private property would be injuriously excluded; that the virtues of liberality and magnificence, with their several offshoots, would be lost from among human perfections. St. Thomas (2^{da}, 2^{dae} Q. 66 A. 2) gives three reasons for possessions in private: first, that the best work will be done when individuals labor for their own separate concerns, in which the interest will *de facto*, with allowance for exceptions, be the keenest.¹ J. S. Mill so far felt the force of this contention that he preferred stimulus to labor before reward to labor already done as a title for holding land. "Landed property," he maintained, "if legitimate, must rest on some other justification than the right of the laborer to what he has created by his labor. The land is not by man's creation, and for a person to appropriate to himself a mere gift of nature is *prima facie* an injustice. A better title is because the strongest interest which the community and the human race have in the land is that it should yield the largest amount of food and other useful or necessary things. So the better cultivation is the best reason that can be given." Mill ought to have admitted both grounds, stimulus and reward. The second motive assigned by St. Thomas is the avoidance of confusion and the securing of order, which reason is valid for division of property as it is for division of labor and of ranks. The third argument might have been merged in the second; it is that peace and contentment are more likely to follow from the proposed arrangement than from communism, though neither system will work without considerable friction. It is the convenience in argument of communism that because it has never been, as its opposite system has been, exclusively or predominantly tried, it has never, like its rival, been proved lamentably defective in certain points, and hence its advocates can prophesy that it is the cure for the worst evils. It is in the opposite condition to that of a Roman Emperor described by Tacitus as "pronounceable by all a capable ruler if he had not ruled." Some defenders are more temperate in their promises, because they are more alive to human limitations under all conditions; and these honest supporters are met by kindred spirits in the opposite camp, who admit the failures of individualism and the successes of social effort, so far as both sets of facts are true. Here at present it is our purpose to insist that individuality, espe-

¹ Many paid managers get an immense interest simply in making a big business or in skillfully conducting a large operation.

cially in so far as it is identical with personality, is a great factor in human progress. While other writers lay stress, and much stress on the view that personality is altruistic, going out to persons beyond self; let us not forget that it is also egoistic, giving a certain due preference to self without injury to others and without refusal of even non-obligatory acts of self-sacrifice (2^{da}, 2^{dae}, Q. 66, A. 2. Lugo: De Justit, et Jure Diss. I. n. 5 et. 6). A person is defined "a substance intelligent, complete in itself and *sui juris*," Hence individual man has a right to attach certain external objects to himself as his own and as amplifications of his own personality, while he is glad that others enjoy the same rights for the securing of which he is ready to lend them a helper's hand.²

The foregoing, which is the classical defense of private property, is seen by modest Socialists to carry weight. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who tries to avoid extravagances, fully concedes that the man who owns no private property does not fully own himself; so much is he enslaved by casual employers or charitable relief officers. The same writer objects to private ownership in the special case of land, but not in case of houses, money and other belongings needful for the fuller life of humanity—all of which appropriations have to be derived to individual possessors from the common stock held by the community for general distribution.

Neither of the philosophers, Aristotle and St. Thomas, is in favor of fortune growing to be immense. The Greek had his own national horror of the unbounded, the immoderate, the excessive, the transgressive of the golden mean; and St. Thomas in giving rules for the guidance of princes tells them not to let self-pushing individuals add house to house and field to field till they dispossess all their neighbors. He adds that for the good life of the individual man two things are needful, the principal of which is a virtuous course of action, and the secondary, which is instrumental to the first, consists in a sufficiency of material. (De Regim. Princip. Lib. I. c. 15.) What the limits of this sufficiency is we may gather in part from the *Summa*, 1^a, 2^{dae}, Q. 105. A. ad 3: Also Aristotle tells us that among certain peoples the law prohibited the sale of possessions except to escape some clear damage. For if a free sale were allowed without restriction, it might happen that all property would be gathered into a few hands, so that the land would be depopulated.³ To-day transactions in business of all sorts are so immense that the

² A purely legal act or a State-made origin of property is defended by some, to the exclusion of the personal exigencies and of God's will and of all moral requirement.

³ The famous *Seldachthela*, attributed to Solon, was a drastic relief bill for debtors out of the hands of money-grabbers.

policy of *laissez-faire* becomes in some measure a necessity; to some degree, but not unlimitedly, we have to let the maxim work that where everybody is allowed to do the very best he can, under the vigilance of the law, to promote his own interests, the interest of the community will at the same time, if not in the same proportion, be advanced. Experience teaches the failure of many law-devised restrictions, such as maximum rates of interest and maximum expenditures on luxuries. Attempts in these directions have been made, and the lesson has been one of great caution in the procedure, since what works well in one quarter works ill in another; or fails to work at all, and so renders law contemptible.

If now we raise the question whether private property follows simply from the law of nature, at once we find how difficult it is to give an exact meaning to the inquiry. Our lawyers say that things become connected with personal rights, not of themselves, but through certain "acts and events," and these are contingent factors, not *à priori* necessities. To exclude all empirical elements from the constituents of morality was on the part of Kant an extravagant flight of abstraction,⁴ for these must always have a place in a concrete claim of property. Nature writes no man's name on any of her articles. She spreads no table with cards on the plates settling where each one is to sit at the banquet of life. Hence something positive has always to enter into every actual determination of a law of nature.⁵ No wonder that the *jus gentium*, which was supposed to be the code of all peoples as distinct from their several peculiar codes (*jura civitatum*) was not described by all writers alike; some called it positive law, others inclined more to calling it natural. Suarez, discussing the point as one of terminology, chooses to take the *jus gentium* to be positive or to be outside the natural law as such. (De Leg. Lib. II., c. 17.) So inextricably is the positive bound up with the natural that in the Church's decrees upon property or upon interest care is needed to distinguish the variable arrangement from the invariable principle. Not every decree is applicable to every age.

From Suarez we will begin in citing the opinions of authors on

⁴ Alles was empirisch ist, ist der Lauterkeit der Sitten selbst höchst nachtheilig. (Grundlegen zur Metaphysik der Sitten 2. Abschau.) Kant glories in keeping the principle of morality wholly abstract and in having as against his opponents a nicht ganz für alle Abstraction verdorbenen Vernunft.

⁵ Communis omnium possessio dicitur de jure naturali: distinctio possessionum et servitus non sunt inductae a natura sed per hominum rationem ad utilitatem humanae vitae 1a, 2dae, Q. 94 a. ad 3. Responsio certa est divisionam rerum factam esse non jure naturali sed jure gentium. (Sylvius in 2dam 2dae, Q. 66, a. 2.)

the question whether property as a right is natural. All through, let us remember that every one will have to admit the intervention of determining "acts and events" from the contingent order. "Some maintain," says Suarez, "that prior to original sin men were under a commandment to hold all things in common, and that though with the fall this prohibition was removed, yet from the aspect of the earliest and best conditions, private property is contrary to *jus naturæ*." Suarez himself denies all proof of such a positive precept given in Paradise or such a natural law. "The division of goods," he very soberly contends, "is not against the natural law or the perceptive; the natural law is but negative, not ordering the division to take place.⁶ Community of goods was in the natural law only so far as this law made no divisions, but left it for men to make them." (De Leg. Lib. II., Cap. 14. nn. 10, 11.) His appeal is to St. Thomas, one of whose utterances is often quoted: "Community of goods is attributed to natural law, not because this dictates that all things are to be held in common and nothing in private; but because natural law makes no division of goods; for the partition follows from human agreement, which is a maker of positive law. Private property, therefore, is not simply by nature, but arises through a human invention" (2^{da}, 2^{dae}, Q. 66, A. 2^{ad} 1). It is a convention, but not purely conventional convention. If this human arrangement is called a "contract" we must not take the term in so precise a sense⁷ as to lay it open to the objection raised by T. H. Green that contract presupposes a *meum* and a *tuum*, and so absolutely cannot give origin to those possessions distinguishable as mine and thine. The same question is discussed by a brother in religion to Suarez, namely, Lugo, in his *De Justitia et Jure*, Lib. I., at the opening of the Sixth Disputation, where we are told that private property not only exists as a fact, but is also a just and expedient arrangement for the reasons assigned by St. Thomas. With this much taken for granted, the inquiry is started as to right *quo jure*? It is replied by Lugo that usually not natural, but positive law, or the *jus gentium*, is asserted to be the ground of the valid claim; for whereas by natural origin all things were held in common, to prevent the inconveniences of this condition men devised a scheme for private ownership.⁸ Lugo then distinguishes *jus naturæ* in the wider acceptance by which

⁶ That is, not directly; indirectly there generally is a natural exigence for division to secure peace and prosperity and to escape chaos.

⁷ As often possession of political power is only in theory from contract, so often much possession of land, now justified at least by proscription, had no formal origin in any contract or other legal title.

⁸ The Romans needed a "*jus gentium*" to judge those within their jurisdiction who had not the privilege of the "*jus Quiritium*" or "*Romanorum*."

it signifies such orderliness as is found in mere animal communities, *quod omnibus animalibus commune est*, and in the narrowest and more usual meaning as limited to the dictates of reason properly so styled. On the latter interpretation Lugo calls the normal divisions of property under present circumstances a matter of natural law in conjunction with the super-addition of a positive enactment, such as natural law itself requires for the common good. Others refuse thus to let "present circumstances" count within the natural law as one of its determinants; the difference is a matter of words, at least between scholastic disputants with whom first principles are concordant. Keeping to his own wider extension of the terms, Lugo declares private property to be by natural law, yet so as to concede all that those substantially require who assert a positive determination over and above nature. The nature which Lugo means is that in the concrete of our developed societies, in which also the several forms of government are natural, though freely selected in details. Always certain "acts and events," variable in particulars, must enter in according to natural law to give it those determinations which the concrete embodiment demands. Such acts are "occupation," taking possession of something open to the procedure and setting up a visible sign of the intention permanently to keep what has been appropriated in a formal way. Given a thickly populated country, like England, the *res nullius* waiting to be appropriated hardly exists, and so our law hardly recognizes it, and in that sense is said to "abhor a vacuum." Still, fish to be caught on the seacoast may serve as an example. Where there is unoccupied land, a sign of possession-taking, which among savages may often be a taboo mark, is more reasonably the obvious cultivation of the soil, to which may be added its enclosure with a fence and later within title deeds.

As to the consent of neighbors that may be rendered either implicitly or explicitly: often the law of nature demands such acquiescence as needful for the common good. "Even wolves," says Huxley, "could not hunt in packs but for a real understanding that they are not to attack one another during the chase" (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 10). This is natural law in Ulpian's wide sense; the scholastic sense has been sufficiently illustrated from Suarez and Lugo.

Our English writers starting from Hobbes are apt not to keep well in view the two parts, that which nature settles in general and that which men settle in particular, according to the prescription of Nature. Hobbes at times pays deference to natural law, but often he speaks as though he had never acknowledged any such fundamental principle. Then he traces all rights to the contract

which sets up the government; and one might think that he acknowledges nothing deeper: "The nature of justice consisteth in the keeping of valid covenants, but the validity of the covenants begins not with the constitution of a civil power sufficient to compel men to keep them, and then it is that propriety begins." (Leviathan, Part II., ch. 15.) If these words are taken quite rigorously, the covenant to keep covenants is the foundation of all covenanted agreement, by reason of the physical force which it first brings to coerce the contracting parties and make them stand by their word; this is the starting point of obligation. Hobbes returns to the subject of property again in chapter 18: "There is annexed to the sovereignty the whole power of prescribing rules whereby every man may know what goods he may enjoy. For before the constitution of sovereignty all men had a right to all things, which necessarily caused war; and therefore this propriety, being necessary for peace, is the act of that power in order to the public peace." Locke, whom Ricardo has followed, rested property too much on the right derived from labor,* and so would limit ownership in land to what the possessor could keep under his own cultivation. Hume was a utilitarian, and therein he had one element of truth, but not the whole. His declarations are that "public utility is the sole origin of justice;" that in a set of people wholly lawless, "justice being no longer of use to a man's own safety or to that of others, he must consult alone the dictates of self-preservation without any regard to others;" that justice would also be non-existent where "perfect moderation and humanity" rendered such a virtue needless; that "right to property rests on its being absolutely requisite to the well-being of mankind and the existence of society." (Essay on Justice *passim*.) Another of our British writers, Father Green, represents in this matter an intelligible adaptation of Hegelianism. He argues that "contract presupposes property. The right to the full life rests on the common will of the society; each member contributes to satisfy the others in seeking to satisfy himself, and each is aware that the others do so; whence there results a common interest in the free play of the powers of all." This fact that quest after self-satisfaction thus led to general satisfaction was put down by Adam Smith piously to "the invisible hand of Providence." ("Wealth of Nations," book III., chap. 1.) "Property," continues Green, "is realized will, where will stands for constant principle operative in all men qualified for any form of society."¹⁰

* Mill's complaint is that property is now distributed almost in inverse ratio to the claims of labor and abstinence.

¹⁰ Condensed from "Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation," nn. 212-218.

In this way man's property answers to the elemental law of self-conservation and self-betterment; for by property, man, as it were, enlarges his own organs or his own self; he is in a way one with his possessions. He satisfied what Bergson calls *l'élan de vie*—the outspring of life into larger and larger existence. Man must be a person of culture, for which property alone can furnish the leisure and the ample means. Man is very incomplete if he just lives from day to day, from hand to mouth, without any prospective wealth of which he feels secure. Each day spent in labor to secure a bare livelihood offers no career worthy of a full spirit; there is about it nothing of liberality, even though from another aspect we acknowledge a dignity which the Greeks contemptuously denied in the patient toil of the need-driven drudge who just supports self and family. Besides cultured individuals, a cultured class is needed, some of whom at least will not only adorn, but greatly help the nation. England owes much to this source, and she must take the use as a compensation for inevitable abuse of a propertied aristocracy.

Diverse as the several views above indicated may seem, there is something of an agreement among them that private property is "what fits nature," and so is right. Some share of it is so fitting as to be also necessary; other parts can claim to be no more than complementary. According to the degrees of necessity, nature is more or less urgent in her dictate that ownership should be established. But in every case "acts and events," as the lawyers say, must intervene to realize nature's demand. For instance, "copyright" in books, with which patent right may be compared, seems the requirement of nature except in some instances, where other provision is at hand; as when authors used to publish their books by patronage, and wealthy subscribers, from an interest in literature or to gain its advertising power in the world of fame, would in sufficient numbers combine to make the writer's venture remunerative in at least a fair degree. Nowadays patrons cannot usually be found in adequate supply to guarantee our teeming publications, and therefore natural justice seems to call for some sort of copyright.

Nevertheless, it does not surprise us to find many lawyers in England talking of the right as purely a creation of the legislature. The point was argued out at length in the case of *Jeffreys versus Boosey*, 1851. It is quite in accordance with the anti-metaphysical temperament of M. Arnold that he should have taken the side of a law-creation for the right, saying: "An author has no property in his productions, but, then, neither has he a natural right to anything whatsoever he may produce or

acquire."¹¹ This view is quite that of Bentham, who declares "natural rights" to be "simple nonsense," "rhetorical nonsense," "nonsense upon stilts." (Works. Vol. II., page 501.) For him property rests simply on utility, backed by positive law, "government creates rights," "property and law are born together." As to copyright, the truth seems to be that in a society like our own, where literary production is a need for the public good as we conceive it, those who work in this service, which in legal phrase presents "valuable considerations," ought to have a security that their labor will be fairly paid; and therefore nature calls upon positive legislation to make some suitable enactment in answer to this claim. Once more we find nature plus "acts and events" concurring to establish a title in justice.

There is always some limit making private property not absolute. The government as an act of jurisdiction at least, if not of reserved ownership, retains its eminent domain, which it can put into exercise when a great public need requires it; then generally there is a sort of enforced sale. Many private proprietors began to emerge at the break-up of the feudal system; at the restoration under Charles II. these secured for themselves too great an exemption from public burdens and from control upon their land; but at the revolution of 1688 that was rectified, at least in part. Thus their property was shown to be not quite absolute. Another test of the absolute lies in *uti et abuti*, upon which restrictions are sometimes properly placed, *abuti* meaning to use up or alienate. A limit to use is set by such maxims as this: *Sic utere jure tuo ut alienum non ladas: Jus est uti et abuti quatenus juris ratio patitur*. The Code Civil lays it down: *Le droit d'usage et de disposer des choses de la manière la plus absolue, pourvu que l'on n'en fasse pas un usage prohibé par les lois ou les règlements*.¹² Aristotle has puzzled commentators by saying that what the law does not command it forbids; at least it is clear that often what the law does not forbid it does not thereby approve. There are

¹¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 1880, p. 322.

¹² Grotius (*De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Lib. II., c. 2, n. 2, and c. 3, nn. 3 and 4) and Pufendorf (Lib. IV., 3, 4, nn. 3 and 4) give on the whole a moderate account of property, if all their principles are taken into account. Montesquieu tends too much in the direction of pure legislation: "Liberty is the right to do what the law allows," Lib. XI., ch. 3. "Property is what law guarantees," XXVI., 15. "The State can limit fortunes to the needs of individuals," VII., 1. The French "Declaration of Rights," 1789, asserted the right of property to be "sound and inviolable," with a claim to compensation if government took it over. Rousseau allowed a man as much property as he could use himself and yet so that "l'état à l'égard de ses membres est maître de leurs biens, par le contrat social qui sert de base à tous les droits." (Lib. III., ch. 9.) In the more extravagant work, "Discours sur l'Inégalité," Rousseau said more than he wanted to defend afterwards, and pleaded a want of previous seriousness.

many uses made of property having only legal toleration. Much the law has to leave unpunished, because its range is necessarily restricted. But moral law is wider, and according to it the individual, while acquiring private property, has to use it in society and ought to see that the employment of what he owns is such that his neighbors cannot reasonably condemn it as injurious to them, or as contrary to the purposes for which society sanctions private possessions. Once more we cannot defend an absolute right, abstracted from all control of circumstances. In a sense which stops short of pure positivism, there is an element of truth claimable for the declaration of Jevons, in his work on "*The State in Relation to Labor*:" "We should rid our minds of the idea that in such matters there are abstract rights;" that is, wholly abstract, incomplete severance from facts of history.

How stands Socialism to our whole system? Among the things which his Socialism is not, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald puts down the negation of private property. He contends that his grievance is the fewness of those who possess any private property now, when nine-tenths of the workers have to put up with a week's wages needed for a week's consumption, without a small margin over, sufficient to be saved up against seasons of unemployment. Thus they are left without liberty of action in their expenditure. "Socialism assumes that individuality requires private property through which to express itself. Man must control and own something, otherwise he does not control and own himself. And if Socialism is not a cut-and-dried set of dogmas to be placed in a system, like one of those puzzles made by cutting up a picture into many confusing fragments, but an idea which is to be realized by a continuation of experimental change, we may rest assured that none of the incidents which are to be met on the way will abolish private property. The ownership of things will always be a way of expressing personality."¹⁸ This passage shows not only how the more thoughtful Socialists set tried results above abstract theories, but also how they admit the use of a fund beyond the money needful for present-day expense, in order that by the surplus they may give to man that freedom of expansion which will make him more fully a man and a more or less cultured ornament of society. How many workmen will use the opportunity for culture if they get it experience has not yet tested, as it has not yet tested how many can by any workable scheme be brought to possess the margin of private property which will afford them leisure for the refinements of life. To further his ideal Mr. MacDonald would allow inheritances, but not in their present shape and magnitude.

¹⁸ "*The Socialist Movement*," p. 129.

On the contrary, he would make his new form of private property much more limited and would have it grow out of "the nationalization of industrial capital and land"—the very thing that is supposed to entail its abolition. Only certain kinds of property can, according to our author, be allowed by the nation to be taken into private possession; land cannot be so disposed of; all inductive argument, says Mr. MacDonald, is against such arrangement, "it being the experience of every people in the world, whether barbaric or civilized, that when land becomes subject to private proprietorship, poverty inevitably follows." (Page 132.) The rejoinder may be made that some extent of inevitable poverty seems to be the price which will always have to be paid for every highly productive civilization in a large nation. But, at any rate, one thought that is valuable in Mr. MacDonald's teaching is that he is not for rapid generalization in theory, nor for headlong applications in practice; he stands for a course of development guided by experience of the past, along with a prudent trust in the future, offering to workers in reward of their services the prospect of private possessions, which will enable them to have a higher life of culture. It is easy to condemn a present system which is producing many evils along with much good; the difficulty is to find the plan which will produce very much good and very few evils. Christianity makes of inevitable poverty a good, and even of voluntary poverty.

J. RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE REVELATION OF THE MONK OF EVESHAM.

THE history of Pre-Dantean Revelations on Hell, Purgatory and Paradise has yet to be written. It is a vast subject, for when the genius of Dante shone like a sun upon the world it put out all the lesser Purgatorial fires kindled by the minor visionaries who lived before his day, and it is only modern scholarship, and in this country the labors of the Henry Bradshaw and the Early English Text Societies, and in Germany of individual archæologists like Herr Roth, who by reprints of early Revelations to monks and nuns have reminded us that such a literature existed. The general reading public, if it ever gives such topics a thought, is probably under the impression that Dante was the first person since St. John the Evangelist to whom such visions of the other world were ever granted; but that is far from being the case,

for in England alone Pre-Dantean Visions go back as far as the seventh century and even earlier; but there is no need to pursue the origin of such literature any further back, or we might find ourselves ultimately landed in the fifth book of Virgil.

To mention only a few of such Revelations, in Germany we have those of the great and famous Abbesses, St. Hildegarde and St. Elisabeth of Schönaue, who lived in the twelfth century; in France the Vision of Barontus, a monk in mid-France, which was recorded in the middle of the seventh century, and about the same period the Vision of St. Fursey, an Irishman and anchorite, contained in the original life of him written in France. In Ireland the literature of the Purgatory of St. Patrick is enormous, among others, the visit of King Owen to St. Patrick's Purgatory in 1153 has been reprinted recently, as has the Vision of Tundal, also Irish.

In England the germ of such Revelations would seem to be found in the Vision of Driethelm or Drithelm, a Northumbrian, father of a family, who lived in the seventh century, and having apparently died, came to life again as his wife and children were standing weeping round his bed, to the terror of them all. He then told them that he had had a Vision of Purgatory, through which place he had been led by an angel, who explained all he saw to him, which Vision he afterwards wrote down and left to the world. When moved by all he had seen he abandoned wife and children and fled first to a monastery and then became an anchorite. This Vision is contained in Bede and in the Chronicle of Roger de Wendover.

In the ninth century this Vision-literature flourished greatly in England, and became very popular among monkish authors, but it was turned largely to political purposes. Later we have the Vision of Thurkell by Ralph de Coggeshall in 1206 and that of the monk of Eynsham, an abridgment of which is to be found in Matthew Paris and Roger de Wendover, and, lastly, the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham, with which we are here concerned. The similarity of the names Eynsham and Evesham has led to a good deal of confusion between these two last-named works, but they are not the same books or writers or places. Eynsham is in Oxfordshire, Evesham in Worcestershire. Mr. Ward in an article on Pre-Dantean literature¹ implies, though he does not say it, that the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham was founded upon the Vision of the Monk of Eynsham, but the intrinsic evidence of the former book does not seem to support this opinion.

The name of the Monk of Evesham to whom this Revelation was made is unknown, but we are able to give a few details of

¹ *British Archaeological Journal*, Vol. XXX.

the state of the Abbey of Evesham and of one or two of his contemporaries. It was a large Benedictine Abbey dedicated to Our Lady St. Mary and St. Egwin, the founder, a local saint. It is agreed by antiquaries that the Revelation was written at the date it professes to have been, namely, 1196; the abbey was then governed, or rather misgoverned, by Abbot Roger Norreys, who reigned from 1192 to 1213, when he was deposed. During his long period of office disputes between him and his monks and also between the monastery and the Bishop of Worcester occupied a great part of the time of the community, the Abbot and monks being apparently agreed only in opposing the Bishop, for though they quarreled with Abbot Norreys themselves, they were loyal to him in his contest with his superior. The champion of the monks in both these campaigns was one of their number, named Thomas de Marleberge, who was elected Prior during the reign of the successor of Roger Norreys, and eventually was himself chosen as Abbot. He was evidently a wise and learned man, who did excellent work for the monastery, for to him we partly owe the celebrated Evesham Book or "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum*."²

A few years before the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham was written, Pope Celestine III. issued a Bull in 1192 authorizing a Pontifical containing forms for Benediction, of vestments, etc., at Evesham Abbey, and this was probably the source from which rather later the above-mentioned Evesham Book or Pontifical was compiled by Thomas de Marleberge, the MS. of which is in the Bodleian Library. It is written in a rather large, clear hand. He

² This "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum secundum Usum Eveshamensis Monasterii*" has been reprinted by the Henry Bradshaw Society, with copious notes by the editor, the Rev. Henry Wilson. It is unique of its kind, and consists of a *Benedictionarium* and full rubrics for the use of the abbot in all the offices performed by him—the order for making catechumens, of making clerics, of professing novices, of making Brothers, the order for holy matrimony, for the burial of a monk, the visitation of a sick Brother, the installation of an abbot, the commendation of a soul, the order of Extreme Unction, various benedictions, the prayers used at Mass and the corresponding rubrics throughout the ecclesiastical year from the Purification to Easter. Directions are also given for the saying or singing of Matins, for the private Mass of the abbot, for his sitting in the cloister to hear the confessions of the Brothers, and especially of the novices, when it is his turn or when he wishes to do so; also for the holding of a chapter, and of the manner of conducting a solemn procession when ordered to take place on one of the seven great feasts celebrated at Evesham. These seven were Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the Assumption of Our Lady, the Deposition and the Translation of St. Egwin and All Saints' Day. These were the only days on which the abbot wore all the episcopal vestments. See "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum secundum Usum Eveshamensis Monasterii*," Henry Bradshaw Society, London, 1893.

also succeeded in getting the constitutions of the abbey confirmed by Papal decree at the Lateran Council in 1215.³

This Pontifical contains the names of four local saints whose cultus was practiced at Evesham, and whose shrines were placed in chapels in the abbey dedicated to them. These were, first, St. Egwin, the founder of the abbey, who died in 717. He was Bishop of Worcester from 693 to 710. He had two feasts, that of his Deposition and death, which was kept on December 30, and that of his Translation, on September 10. Second, St. Odulf, who was a Canon of Utrecht and died in 865; third, St. Credan, who was the eighth Abbot of Evesham after St. Egwin, whose feast was celebrated on August 19, and lastly, St. Wulson or Wulstan, who was Bishop of Worcester in the eleventh century. He is often confused with a holy anchorite named Wulfsey or Wulsey,⁴ a contemporary of the Bishop's, who lived for over forty years as a recluse in Worcester Cathedral, in a cell with a squint from which he could see the high altar. He also lived for many years as an anchorite in a cave near Evesham. St. Wulstan at first refused from humility the See of Worcester, but Wulfsey reproved him for so doing, and he then accepted the bishopric and was honored as a saint after his death.

The Monk of Evesham was probably an Englishman, for he wrote in the English of his time; but the spelling and punctuation, which no doubt suffered at the hands of subsequent copyists, are so bad and some of the vocabulary is so archaic that in making quotations we shall be obliged to modernize it sufficiently to make it intelligible. He was a young man at the time he received the Revelation, which he either wrote or dictated to another person, in order to edify, instruct, warn and awe others, the laity perhaps more even than religious, with an account of the terrors of Purgatory and the joys of Paradise, through which he, like Dante after him, made the journey he describes. Like the great poet, he does not hesitate to record the justice meted out to kings and Bishops, prelates, abbots, priests, judges, laymen and laywomen, as well as to monks and nuns and all classes of society, though this English Dante is less personal than the great visionary.

In the Revelation of our monk those who were highest in ecclesiastical rank were punished most severely for their sins, or as he beautifully says, "they were grieved in a more special bitterness of pains above others." He had a great friend among the monks who was also one of his confessors, and to him and another monk

³See Preface to "The Revelation of the Monk of Evesham" in Edward Acker's English Reprints.

⁴See Noabre's "History of Worcester."

he told part of the things he had seen during his trance in which the Revelation was made to him. The eight first chapters contain a most graphic description of his illness which preceded his trance, and are apparently written by a third person; from the ninth chapter the Revelation is written in the first person.

He was grievously ill for fifteen months, and nothing the leech did seemed to help him, but rather to make him worse, at which we are not surprised, knowing the ignorance of the physicians of that day and their drastic methods of treatment. He was sometimes unable to take anything for the space of nine days but a little warm water; "during the last three months he was more diseased and enfeebled than ever he was before." During Holy Week he began to amend and walked about the infirmary with the help of his staff, and on the eve of Scherethursday, that is, Wednesday in Holy Week, he went to church to matins and lauds, which were sung that night by the monks. "And there by the respect of heavenly grace so great compunction and sweetness he received, that his holy devotion exceeded measure. Wherefore he might not contain himself from weeping and lauding God from midnight till six of the bell in the morning," when "he made to be called to him two of his brethren, one after another, which had power to hear confessions and give to penitents absolution,⁵ and to them both made purely and holy as meekly as he could his confession of all his sins and of the least offense of his religion or of the commandments of God, and with great contrition of heart desired his absolution and had it." . . . He spent all Holy Thursday in praising God and the next night went to the church to matins and lauds again.

His trance, which began on Good Friday morning, is most graphically described in chapter 2: "On Good Friday when the convent rose to come to church to say prime as they passed the chapter house they saw the same sick Brother lie prostrate and barefoot before the Abbot's seat; his face was flat to the ground, as though he should by the order ask mercy of every president. Then the brethren, seeing this marvel, ran thither, willing to take him up. They found him as a man lifeless, without any motion of any member of his body. Truly, his eyes were fallen deep down into his head and the eyes and nose of him covered with blood, wherefore they said all that he was dead. His feet were full cold, but in the remainder of his body was found a little warmth.

⁵ The form of absolution used by the abbot after the confiteor in the Evesham book is almost identical with that in use among Dominicans at the present day. It is the old form in use in St. Dominic's day throughout the Church, but the Evesham book inserts the word "pariter" between "perducat nos" and "ad vitam eternum."

"At the last was perceived in him a little thin breath and a moving of his heart. Then they washed his head, breast, hands and feet with cold water. And then first they saw all his body to tremble and quake, but anon he ceased and was insensible. So long time they mused and doubted what they might do to him while they saw him not verily dead, neither anything amending. At the last by counsel they had him to his bed, there to be kept with great attendance of keepers."

The third chapter tells how, while the brethren were wondering at this illness, a still more marvelous thing happened, for they found the great crucifix used in the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, which had been kept all Lent in the church between the wall and the altar, bleeding freshly from the wound of the right foot and also of the right side. And the staff and shoes of the sick Brother were found by it. Greatly astonished at this miracle, as the monks firmly believed it to be, they met in the chapter house and all took "disciplines of rods," and then went to the church and lying prostrate on the ground, "said weepingly the seven psalms of penance to get our Lord's mercy." The sick Brother continued in the same unconscious state till sunset on Easter eve; they opened his mouth and cast in warm spices and herbs to revive him, but he could not swallow; they put plaisters to his breast and arms, but all in vain; they pricked and scraped the soles of his feet with needles, but no sign of life was to be seen, except a little red color in his cheeks and a little warmth in his body was perceptible. "Also they made a great horn to be blown there, but nothing it booteth."

Chapter 4 describes how he came to himself again on Easter eve about the time of Compline, very gradually, and the first intelligible words he said were: "O Sancta Maria! O Sancta Maria! Oh, my Lady Sancta Maria!" over and over again. Presently his eyes gradually opened and then he began to weep bitterly, and continued for a long time to do so, then after learning that he had been unconscious and like one dead since Good Friday morning, he asked for a crucifix to be brought him, that he might make his adoration, and when a silver one was given him he "watered the feet of the Cross with kisses and tears unto the tediousness of some standing by," for he made a very long thanksgiving for all the benefits he and the whole Church had received from God. At length his brethren begged him to take some meat after his long fast, and he directed them to bring him a little bread and honey, which he ate and then rose and went to matins with the others and entered the choir without any help at midnight.

We pass on now to Chapter 14, in which the monk tells us how

in his trance St. Nicholas of Bari appeared to him and led him through Purgatory, which terrible journey he goes on to describe. His conception and construction of Purgatory differ from the Mount of Purgatory of Dante, for he conceived it to be circular and on a plain; in the centre is Heaven, surrounded by rings of fields of pleasure or pain; the outermost circle of this huge circumference is entered at death by the soul when it leaves the body, and it is described as penetrating deeper and deeper towards the innermost centre through first the three fields of Pain, then through the field of Paradise, until it reaches the Gate of Heaven. This beautiful idea of the soul penetrating deeper and deeper and going ever more and more inwards through the three circles of Purgatorial pains and the field of the Paradise of joy and bliss seems to have a mystical meaning, teaching that the more interior the soul becomes the nearer it approaches to Heaven and the deeper it penetrates into celestial mysteries.

The picture he paints of the pains of Purgatory is very terrible as he followed "that worshipful old father, the holy and blessed Bishop St. Nicholas, whom he specially loved, to a certain region that was full wide and over horrible foul and miry of thick clay." Then he saw an innumerable company of wretched men and women of every condition, class, profession and order, ordained to divers kinds of pains according to their various sins. And he understood "for what sins they were punished and the kind of sin and the measure and quality of their satisfaction, the which they deserved either by contrition and confession of their offenses or by the remedies and help of other benefits done for them."

"Infinite kinds and diversities of pains were they that I saw. Some of them were roasted at the fire. Some were fryed in a pan. Some were also rasyd (i. e., scraped) with fiery nails unto the bones and to the loosening of their joints. Some were sodden in baths of pitch, and brimstone with an horrible stench and other things melted by heat as lead, brass and other divers metals. And some were gnawed with the venomous teeth of wonderful worms. Some also were cast down thick in a row and smitten with sharp stakes and palings whose ends were all fire. And while some were hanged on gallows, others were drawn with hooks, and some were beaten sore with scourges. . . . Truly, of the persons many were Bishops and Abbots and others were of other dignities. For I saw some that were clerks, monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen."

The person of highest rank whom he saw there was a certain King of England, probably William Rufus or Stephen; the monk himself lived in the reign of Richard I. He does not tell us the

name of the King he saw in Purgatory, but he was sometime King of England, and in his life was full mighty among the princes of this world. He was one who oppressed the people with taxes and revenged himself cruelly on any man who "slew his venery," that is, who poached in his preserves. Our Monk would seem to have been liberal in his political opinions, for he says that "hart and hind, bock and doe ought by the law of kind to be slain by every man." This King would put to death or cruelly maim these poachers, and as he did little penance for such acts in his life, he was terribly tortured in Purgatory, as also for the unlawful pleasures and lusts in which he had indulged.

The vision of this King is very graphically described. "He sat upon an horse that blew out of her mouth and nose a flame black as pitch, mingled with a smoke and stench of hell unto the grievous torment of him that sat thereon, who was armed at all points as he would have gone to battle. Truly, the armour that he wore was to him intolerable pain, for it was as bright burning iron is when it is beaten with hammers, and smiteth out fiery sparks," by which he was burnt both inside and outside. "Also as touching his helmet, his shield, his habergeon and his leg-harness I leave out," for no man can tell how much he was pained by the burning heat and weight of them. "Soothly he would have given all the world if he might have been delivered from one spur, with which he was compelled to steer his wretched horse to run, whereby often he fell down headlong. Also the saddle he sat upon was stuck through on both sides with fiery brooches and nails, which was a ghastly sight for any man to behold, and the maw and inward bowels of him who sat in the saddle were sore-smitten through by the sharpness of the brooches and nails, and thus cruelly was he punished for the unlawful shedding of men's blood and for the foul sin of avowtry (perjury) that he used. This King complained sorely because neither his sons nor his friends whom he had left behind and who were indebted to him for many temporal goods did anything after his death for his relief and help. He bewailed, too, that his deceitful and flattering people had done nothing for him since his death, though he had done so much for them in his lifetime. The Monk saw him somewhat eased and relieved by the prayers of religious men to whom in his lifetime he was for God's sake oftentimes very benevolent, and through their prayers he hoped to be saved.

Another class of persons severely punished whom the Monk saw were fugitives from religion, who ran out of their order in which they had bound themselves to God, and afterwards turned again to the world as "a dog turneth again to his vomit," and

though they had bitterly repented and made a good confession before their death, their apostasy was grievously punished for a long time.

He wondered that he saw so few priests in Purgatory "out of the great number that is of them in all the world that had deserved pains after their death for breaking their vow of chastity, and to this it was answered that it was seldom that any of them were very penitent or contrite while they lived for their sins, wherefore there is no doubt that the great multitude of them are utterly damned."

We must remember that at no time in the Church's history could this reproach, often most unjustly brought against the Catholic priesthood by Protestant writers, have been deserved so much as in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; that is, about the period at which the Monk of Evesham was writing.

Here and there this terrible picture of Purgatorial suffering is lightened by an unconscious touch of nature making the twelfth and twentieth centuries akin, when he tells us that he saw "good religious men suffer full sore and grievous pains, only because they delighted and took a pleasure in the fairness of their hands and long fingers."

He points an excellent moral from the terrors of this first Field of Pain, saying: "Let us that be now alive still in this world see and consider by this how greatly we ought to give ourselves to chastising our wicked conditions and to amend our living and also how much we should labor to exercise us to keep the commandments of God, and to do good works by the which and the mercy of God we may deserve to be delivered before of so great evils. And also that our dear friends, as father and mother, sister and brother, and others that were sometime our lovers, there sore punished for their offenses, might be delivered the sooner from them by good deeds and works of mercy and pity devoutly done by us for their redemption and helping."

We come now to the second place of Purgatory, which he describes as a high hill, up almost to the clouds and divided from the first place of Purgatory. "And then lightly and sweetly we went on this same high hill. And there was under the farther side of this hill a full, deep valley and a dyke set with bushes and bracken on every side, hanging out, whose length no man might see. And in the lower part of the said valley was a full, broad pond of horrible black water. And out of that same pond busily brake a mist of an indescribable stench."

And from one side of this hill came forth a great fire, whose flames were cast up to heaven, and on the other side was great

cold of snow and hail and other cruel storms, so that he thought that he saw nothing so painful and cruel as that cold was. And this valley was as full of souls as hives swarm full of bees. And these souls were tormented by being first cast into the pond above mentioned, and then taken up and cast into the fire, "and they were borne up on high by the violent flames like sparks in a furnace, and so let down on the other side of the hill to the horrible cold of snow, hail and sharpness of storms, and then again cast down into the pond. And some of them were longer punished in the fire, and some in the cold, and some were tarried longer in the grievous stench of the pond. Some had lighter punishments than others, and the nearer they came to the end of the place the easier and softer waxed their pains. But the torments of this second place were much harder and sharper than those they saw in the first Field of Pain." He found also many more of his acquaintances in this second place than in the first; he recognized them immediately, although the stature and form of some of them were as though they had been lessened or thinned by torments.

In the third place of Purgatory, in which the worst vices and sins were punished, the torments and pains suffered were far worse than in either of the other two Fields of Pain. This was a great field set in a low ground apart from all other places, so that none might come thither except those that were there punished. "Truly, the over-part of this field was covered with a full, horrible cloud in the which was resided a smoke of brimstone with a mist; a great stench and a flame black as pitch was mingled with them, which brake out on every side like hills and so spread all abroad. And the plainness of that place was so replete and full-filled with worms as floors are wont to be strewn with rushes." He goes on to describe these words and the devils that he saw tormenting the souls with fiery instruments, and so great were the torments and horrors of this third place that being absent he cannot remember them without great horror, but the presence and companionship of St. Nicholas enabled him to bear the sight. We pass over the details of these tortures to describe some of the interviews he had with individual souls in Purgatory before we follow him to Paradise.

In the second place of Pain he saw a certain goldsmith who was a citizen of Evesham, whom he had known very well when alive and who had died suddenly from drink.

The story is told at too great length to quote in full, so we must endeavor to abridge it without spoiling it, for the account given by the goldsmith of his struggle against his sin is very pathetic. The Monk had had scruples about praying for the poor man's soul, whom all his neighbors had condemned to hell, because he under-

stood the saying of St. John that "there is a sin unto death I do not say that ye shall pray for such" to mean a sin continued in unto death, as this man's was; but, nevertheless, he did pray for him, and when we hear the life the man led we can but wonder at any one hesitating to do so.

When the Monk saw the goldsmith in Purgatory he had passed through the very worst of his pains, and he beheld him suffering lightly and in good hope, at which he wondered, and St. Nicholas, seeing that they knew each other, told the Monk to speak to his former friend. Accordingly, they saluted each other, and the goldsmith bowed to and worshiped St. Nicholas, who, he said, had saved him, and he then told them both how he came to be saved when, as he knew, all his friends believed him to be lost eternally, because he had died suddenly in his sin.

He acknowledges that he had continued in this sin all his life, but he says, "Nevertheless, it was not my will, for greatly it displeased me, and mickle I sorrowed that I knew not how to leave that vice. Soothly, oftentimes I rose against myself, surely purposing to leave and cast away the foul sin of drunkenness that I was held in. But, anon, what for the lust of drinking and the importunity of fellowship I was constrained to drink after the measure of mine old custom, whereby I was overcome and drawn again bound into the lust and custom of the same sin." . . . And then he goes on to tell of his great devotion to St. Nicholas, and to say that no matter how tipsy he might be in the evening he was always present in the morning at Matins, and often there in church before the parish priest. And he kept at his own cost a lamp ever burning in St. Nicholas' chapel. And he took care that the church was provided with all the necessary ornaments and lights, and if he could not afford to buy all that was needed himself, he got other parishioners to help him. Twice a year he went to confession and Holy Communion, at Christmas and Easter, "taking penance and in part diligently fulfilling it. Truly, I did not observe and keep those things that I was commanded of my ghostly father, for oftentimes I left some things that I should have done. And of the commandment of my ghostly father I fasted the days of Advent, as I did the Lent season. To the which days of Advent I added of mine own free will as many days before Advent as would make up the days of Lent. And so on Christmas Day I would be houselled and receive the holy Sacrament of our Lord's precious Body and Blood. But, alas for sorrow! when that I should have been that holy day of our Lord's birth more holier and devouter in my living than at other times, I turned me contrary to other works and businesses of a worldly custom, where-

fore it happened unto me also in my last end that the wicked angel of that devil Satan, the which is cause and kindler of all evil, scorned me. And also he had brought pleasant tidings of my loss and damnation to his father the devil, if the mercy and goodness of my lord St. Nicholas had not withstood him, therefore evermore to him be thanks for all his true services for my deliverance."

The goldsmith then describes his death, which took place on the third day after Christmas Day, when he fell into his old sin in spite of all the good resolutions he had made at his Christmas Communion, and died in his sleep. "For my departing out of this world was so hasty and swift that my soul was gone and passed out of my body ere my wife understood or knew it or had time to send for the priest."

The goldsmith had died about fifteen months before the Monk saw him in Purgatory, but by the merits of his patron, St. Nicholas, he was making quicker progress towards Paradise than any one he saw there, from which the Monk counsels his readers to serve the saints of God devoutly in this life, that when they come to Purgatory they may be helped by them in their great need.

Among others whom he saw in the first place of Purgatory was an anchoress whom he knew very well and loved greatly, and when he saw her there he believed it to be his imagination, for she was alive when he fell into his ecstasy, but when he came to himself and a few days after wished to send her a message by a friend, he learned that she had died while he was unconscious, and then he believed it was true that he had really seen her in Purgatory. He tells us that "she was stable and steadfast in countenance and fair of beholding, whom the laborious way that she had gone had wearied a little, and with the pains of fire that others were involved here and there she was often touched and somewhat burnt; but she full little counted it and hastened her speedily on the journey that goeth to Paradise."⁶

He also saw in this same first Field of Purgatory a certain Bishop whom he knew, who was born "in this ground of Inglande and had his bishopric beyond the seas." He had died that same year about the Feast of St. Michael, and the Monk saw him burn-

⁶ We have not been able to trace this anchoress, but probably she was a Benedictine nun living as an anchoress in the Benedictine priory at Worcester, as there was accommodation there for two anchoresses, who lived enclosed in cells attached to the priory in 1240—that is, about forty years after the Revelation to the monk. In the Middle Ages anchoresses frequently chose the precincts of monasteries as safe places in which to have their cells placed. Or it is possible this anchoress, as the monk knew her so well, may have inhabited the cell at Evesham in which the anchorite Wulfsey at one time lived. See "Anchoresses of the West," by Francesca M. Steele, page 248.

ing almost continually in flames of fire because "of the vicious life he lived in his youth." But as he "burnt busily in the fire he had evermore a full honest cloth upon him, the which not only was hurt by the fire, but also was made by it fairer and seemlier than it was before." And St. Nicholas told the Monk that this cloth was a privilege granted to the Bishop, because in his life he had ever had compassion on the poor and naked and had liberally relieved them, "so his clothing shall never lack fairness till he has fulfilled his penance and taken of God the stole of everlasting joy and bliss." In the second place of Pain he saw three other Bishops and an Archbishop of Canterbury. But now from all this darkness and horror and pain and suffering we will follow our Monk and his leader to "the full, merry and jocund place of Paradise."

He warns us that no man can sufficiently describe the delights of this place, but promises that as he can he will. After passing through the three dread places of Purgatory they went further, and as they went by little and little and more and more appeared to them a full, fair light and with the light came also a sweet and pleasant savor. Then they came to a field in which were all manner of fair and beautiful flowers, that gave them incredible pleasure to behold! And in this field they saw "infinite thousands of souls full, jocund and merry in a full, sweet rest after their penance and after their purgation. And those souls that were in the beginning of this field had on white clothing, but it was not very bright, neither well-shining, nevertheless it had no spot of blackness nor of any uncleanness on it." And he saw many there whom he knew full well in the world, and he mentions a certain Prior who had lived devoutly and died holily, and a certain young monk who lived in the same monastery as this Prior; also a "worshipful priest," who in his life did much good by his preaching, and a certain Abbess of wonderful conversation whom he had known when he was a child. The Prior seems to have been a very great saint, for "he bare evermore while he lived the habit of a monk both on his body and in his heart, from the time of his childhood to his old age and to his last end." He was very meek and patient and used great abstinence and long watching, and when necessity compelled him to be about works of charity, he would be ever saying some psalms or other devout prayers to God. He suffered the loss of an eye a year or two before his death, and other limbs of his body failed him, but he was never absent from choir or any conventual duties, and when the hour of his death drew near he lay in a hair shirt and ashes, and after saying many prayers with great compunction he expired blessing his brethren devoutly.

The night before he died this Prior had a vision about the hour of Matins, in which he saw our Lord Jesus and our Blessed Lady

St. Mary coming to him, "and with a full, meek sign they made a token to him that he should follow them, and immediately after he called for his brethren and told them the vision that he had seen, and announced to them that he would die the next day, and so he did."

It was this Prior who pointed out to the Monk of Evesham the above-mentioned young monk of his monastery, who had lived a most pure and innocent life as a monk from a child and had died young, fortelling the day of his death and the hour of it. "And also heavenly melody was heard at his passing, as many can tell that were there in the monastery at the same time." Both the Prior and this young monk had suffered a little in Purgatory for their faults, but the Prior trusted to receive a greater reward in Paradise than the young monk, because by living longer he had been able to do more good works and win more merit.

The Abbess had died thirteen years before our Monk saw her in Paradise; she had been a very wise woman, very devout, very fervent and very zealous in ruling her community, and when the Monk saw her she had only newly arrived from Purgatory, and although "she had upon her clean clothing, it was not very white nor shining."

She had suffered very sharp pains in the first place of Purgatory, because she had not overcome the vice of vainglory and for "other innumerable things by which good people offend," which the Monk passes by. But he was very much surprised to learn from her that she had specially suffered the pains of Purgatory because she had "loved her kinsfolk overmuch carnally" and had given them much of the goods of her monastery, and this while some of her spiritual daughters were in need of clothing and other necessities.

The Monk of Evesham marveled when he heard this, because "he knew no prelate who used so great sharpness to their kinsfolk as she seemed to him to show to her cousins." And also instead of marrying her nephews and nieces she took them into religion to serve God, and she behaved so sternly to them specially that "while to strangers she was seen to be friendly and easy, to her cousins she was right unmild." And she used to inquire their faults, and if perchance she found them in fault she would punish them full bitterly. And she favored no brother or sister so much as those who were not her kin. The Monk said this to the Abbess, and she replied that, although it was true, nevertheless she could find no excuse when examined by God for the carnal affection and love that she had inwardly to her relations after she was bound to religion. And when the worshipful Abbess had told him

these and other things he and St. Nicholas went forth further into the same joyful field, and as they went more inward and further into that joyful place of Paradise "they had evermore a clear light and felt a sweeter savor, and those whom they found and saw there were whiter and gladder than those whom they had seen before."

"And whereto should I tarry here now to number the persons and their merits which I saw there that I knew sometime before in the world and some that I knew not before? For all that were there in that place were ordained to be the citizens of the high and everlasting Jerusalem, and all had passed the strife and the battle of this world and were victors of devils, and so lightly they went through all pains as they were before less cumbered and held by wretched living and worldly vices."

Meditation on the Passion of our Blessed Lord was evidently a great and favorite devotion of the Monk of Evesham, for he makes the contemplation of the Crucifixion one of the joys of Paradise. But he tells us that the things they saw as they went forth further into this same place no tongue can tell and no man's mind may worthily consider nor describe it in words.

A vision of the holy Cross of Christ's Passion was presented and shown to infinite thousands of holy souls a little further on, who were standing about it and worshiping it as though our Lord had been present in His body. "Truly, there was seen the meek Redeemer of mankind, our sweet Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as He had been done fresh upon the Cross." And at this great and wonderful spectacle, which he describes in terms too solemn and realistic to quote, "stood His holy Mother, our Blessed Lady St. Mary, not now in heaviness and mourning, but right gladsome and joying, and there also stood with her the sweet disciple of Christ, St. John, the blessed evangelist, and who may now conceive in mind how those holy souls ran thither on every side gladly and lightly to see and behold that blessed sight." This vision did not continue very long, but was taken away from the blessed souls, who then returned to their own places with great joy and gladness.

The two pilgrim souls now come to the Gate of Heaven, after they have gone more and more inward, the beauty of the place and their joy therein ever increasing as they advanced, till at last they beheld a full, glorious wall of crystal, whose height no man might see and length no man might consider. And when they reached the wall they saw therein "a full, fair, bright, shining gate which stood open, save that it was signed and laid over with a cross. The cross was set in the midst of that gate, and now it was lifted up on high, and so gave them that came hither an open

and a free entry, and afterward it was let down again and so barred others out that would have come in. But how joyful they were that went in, and how reverently they tarried that stood without abiding the lifting up of the cross again I cannot tell. Soothly here St. Nicholas and I stood still together, and the liftings up of the cross and the lettings down again, whereby some went in and some tarried without, I beheld with great wonder." And at the last St. Nicholas and the Monk came thither to the same gate hand in hand. "And when we came thither the cross was lifted up. And so they that were there went in. Soothly then my fellow St. Nicholas freely went in, and I followed, but suddenly and unadvisedly the cross came down upon our hands and parted me from my fellow St. Nicholas, and when I saw this full sore afraid I was. Then said St. Nicholas to me: 'Be not afraid, but only have full certain trust in our Lord Jesus Christ, and doubtless thou shalt come in.' And after this my hope and my trust came again and the cross was lifted up and so I came in."

Truly, our Monk was a poet, though he wrote in prose, and a great mystic, though so little known, for is there even in the "*Divina Commedia*" a more beautifully symbolic idea than this of the Gate of Heaven being barred by the Cross, through the elevation of which alone souls could enter Heaven?

He now attempts to describe the brightness of the light inside the gate, which though it shone more marvelously than any he had ever yet seen, yet "dulled not a man's sight, but rather sharpened it." But they were not permitted to see anything inside except the light and the crystal wall through which they had entered, and from the ground to the top of the wall were steps, up which all the souls who had entered were climbing, without any labor or difficulty, and the higher they went the gladder they were. And then the Monk looked up high and he saw sitting on a throne of joy our Lord in the likeness of a man, but yet he knew for certain that this place where he "saw our Lord sitting was not the Heaven of heavens, where the blessed spirits of the angels and the holy souls of righteous men join in the sight of seeing God in His majesty as He is, for no mortal man can see that sight."

They were not permitted to remain long here, for St. Nicholas, who held the Monk by the hand, told him very soon that he must now go back again to himself and the world, "and turn from that heavenly bliss to this world's wretchedness."

The Revelation closes with a marvelous description of the sweet peal of bells that the Monk heard in Paradise, and tells how he came to himself. "And while the holy confessor St. Nicholas

yet spake with me, suddenly I heard there a solemn peal and a ringing of a marvelous sweetness, as if all the bells in the world had been rung together at once. Truly, in this peal and in this ringing brake out also a marvelous sweetness and a varying mingling of melody-sound withal. And I knew not whether the greatness of the melody or the sweetness of the sounding of the bells was more to be wondered at. And to so great a noise I took good heed and full greatly my mind was suspended to hear it. Soothly immediately that that great and marvelous sound and noise ceased, suddenly I saw myself parted from the sweet fellowship of my duke and leader St. Nicholas."

He now goes on to describe his coming back to life after his trance. "Then I returned to myself again, and I heard the voices of my brethren that stood about its (sic) bed, also my bodily strength came again to me a little and a little, and my eyes opened to the use of seeing as you saw right well. Also my sickness and feebleness by which I was for so long a time so sorely diseased was outwardly gone from me, and I sat up before you as strong and mighty as I was before sorrowful and heavy. And I weened that I had been then in the church before the altar, where I first worshiped the cross."

He goes on to say that while he thought that this vision had only lasted for the space of one Matins, he found from his brethren on coming to himself that it had lasted for nearly two days. And from that time it was most delightful to him to hear any solemn peal of bells ring, for it always brought to his memory the sweet peal and melody he had heard when he was among the blessed souls in Paradise. And when he heard the monastery bells ring on Easter eve for Compline, he knew that the bells he heard in Paradise were ringing so beautifully to usher in the same feast of Easter.

For many days after he returned to himself the young Monk was continually weeping, and then a miracle is recorded in chapter the last but one, which the writer quotes as a proof that the Revelation was true, lest he says there should be such great infidelity or infirmity of any one as would prevent him from believing in the truth of this vision, in which it is evident the Monk himself and all his religious brethren most firmly believed. It seems that for over a year before his trance he had suffered intolerable pain from a great sore, large and broad, on his left leg, like a cancer or canker as it is here written. And so great was the pain in this sore that the Monk was wont to say it was as though a hot plate of iron was bound tightly to his leg. And no ointment or poultices or any doctor had ever done him any good, though he had

tried many remedies. But during this trance he was so completely cured that he himself marveled with the other monks to "feel and see that the pain and ache with the wound were clean gone, so that no token of it nor any sign of redness or of whiteness remained." The only difference between this left leg and the right one now was that there was no hair in the place where the sore had been.

Whether the Revelation was true or false, the Monk was so firmly convinced that it came from God that he wrote it down for the warning, comfort and instruction of his countrymen, and, at any rate, it contains, as we hope we have shown, much that is both edifying and beautiful, to say nothing of the many incidental touches that throw such light upon the great faith and piety of the people of England in pre-Reformation days, when the country merited her proud title of the Dowry of Mary.

F. M. STEELE.

Stroud, England.

THE MARIAVITES.

THE miscellaneous and nondescript army of men who, in nearly every country of Europe, are waging an open or covert war upon the Church of Christ and her dogmas has of late years recruited its ranks most largely in Catholic Poland. This newest ally of the powers of error is all the more dangerous and insidious because, little known and appreciated so far at home and abroad, he stalks unchecked throughout the land in the Scriptural "sheep's clothing." For, depending upon the reawakened interest in mysticism, which is one of the strange contradictions of our own days, this Jansenistic sect has been able to work great havoc in an incredibly short space of time. The condemnation of the movement by the Holy See on September 15, 1906, came none too soon. From the Papal bull we should learn to be wise enough to be on our guard against the well-planned and systematic propaganda which the new sect carries on. With its vague teaching and mystical sensationalism the Mariavites would no doubt make rapid progress in America,

¹ Bei den Mariaviten. Eindrücke von einer neuen romfreien katholischen Kirche. Lichterfeld: Berlin, 1911.

² Mankietnichy i mankietnictwo. Posen, 1910.

³ Kacerska sekta mankietnikow, jeg poczatek i odstepstwo od kasciola. Warsaw, 1906.

⁴ De Wijding van J. Kowalski tot Bisschop der Mariaviten. Utrecht, 1911.

⁵ Mariavity v Tzarstve polskom. Solkine. St. Petersburg, 1910.

where religion must daily change its face to be acceptable to certain men who have strayed far afield in search of a new Christ and an up-to-date Gospel.

Up to a short time ago we had little opportunity of learning anything definite about the Mariavite teaching. The article in Herder's "Conversations Lexikon" is good as far as it goes. The "Catholic Encyclopedia" has overlooked the movement. The latest work by Arthur Rhode¹ is absolutely worthless and unreliable. The best authorities, which, however, are accessible to a very limited circle, are J. Kantal², Dr. Barmacin³, E. Driessen⁴ and I. Rovinsky⁵. We borrow all we shall have to say in this article from these four standard witnesses.

The adherents of the movement are known by various names. Thus they glory in the name of Mariavites, which they claim was revealed to the foundress by heaven. Sometimes, too, they are called Kozlovites, after the patronymic of their foundress. More frequently still they go by the name of Manchettists, from the fact that the priests, the better to show their spirit of evangelical poverty, adopted the practice of wearing black cuffs, or "monkietnicz," as these are called in the language of the land.

The foundress of the sect, Felicia Kozłowska, was born at Plozk in 1862, being the daughter of the seamstress, Anna Olszewska, who had married the forester, James Kozłowska, and borne him several children. In the early 80's the family settled at Warsaw, where Felicia enjoyed the advantages of a convent education. Returning to Plozk, she opened a tailoring establishment of her own, which never seemed to thrive much. She was frequently reduced to the necessity of depending upon the charity of her friends. Seeking consolation for her dejected spirits, she chose as her spiritual director the Capuchin, Father Honorat, who lived in the nearby convent of Zakrocym. With his consent she entered the Third Order of St. Francis. About this time a certain priest, graduate in theology of the Catholic Theological Academy of St. Petersburg, Casimer Przyjemski, came to Plozk as curate. He was a very ascetic man, neurasthenic and poorly grounded in theology, as Dr. Barmacin remarks. He was eaten up with the desire to reform the clergy and bring them on the ways of a highly exaggerated ascetical life. Basing his proposed reform on the Third Order of St. Francis, Przyjemski received the approval of the Capuchins, Fathers Procop and Honorat, who in their turn introduced him to Felicia Kozłowska.

Now, it happened that precisely at this time Felicia began to speak confidentially to her friends about a vision which had been vouchsafed her on the feast of Portiuncula, August 2, 1893, in which God had communicated to her His wish to see a congregation of priests and pious women founded, to be known by the name of Mariavites.

By means of this association the world at large, and especially the lax clergy of the land, would soon be brought back to fervor and God-fearing ways. Her tailoring establishment was designated as the chosen centre of the movement, and she was entrusted with the supreme direction of all the members, even those of the clergy. "The priests," so she avers the Saviour spake to her, "who open their hearts and minds to you will receive as a reward for their humility an extraordinary spirit of prayer, together with other special graces." The preliminary work towards the foundation of the society was undertaken by Pryzjemski, who implicitly believed in the visions of Felicia. Devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Help, and later on to the Blessed Sacrament, formed the distinctive mark of the organization. The primitive rule of St. Francis was adopted as the basis of the society. The vows of poverty, chastity and obedience were enjoined, and the clergy began to wear black cuffs as their distinctive badge. As Franciscans they soon instituted provincials. Pryzjemski was chosen for the Diocese of Plozk, Wiechowicz for Warsaw, Prochniewski for Lublin. Kowalska was elected general. A convent of women, who followed the rule of St. Clare, was opened, with Kozłowska acting as superioress. At the same time Kozłowska arrogated to herself undisputed authority over the masculine branch of the association, which so far was entirely composed of priests, some fifty in number. Chief amongst these was the spiritual director of the Seminary of Plozk, Leo Golebiowska, who has the distinction of having first called the foundress "Mateczka"—"the Little Mother"—by which name Kozłowska is always spoken of by her own. The sugar and milk for his tea, of which he now began to deprive himself, were daily carried to the foundress. Other clerical adherents of the first hour—all of whom were from the ranks of the junior clergy—were Ceslaus Czerwinski, Rytel, Zbirochowicz and Wencelaus Zebrowski.

The strict poverty which the first clerical members of the association practiced soon made it possible for them to purchase an imposing, palatial residence for the Mateczka, who had in the meantime assumed the religious name of Maria Francesca and adopted a gray garb. Here the meetings of the society were convened until prohibited by the Bishop of Plozk, who forbade his priests to join hands in the movement. The clerical members were dispersed. This action had the effect of spreading the organization in the outlying corners of the diocese. For the priests, driven from a centre where propaganda for the cause could be made in clerical circles, obtained leave from the foundress to admit laymen as members of the Third Order of the society. The better to dupe the poorly instructed but pious peasants, these priests began to call their organization by the

orthodox name of "Confraternity of Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament." The new recruits bound themselves to spend a fixed time each day before the Blessed Sacrament. Fifteen persons were gathered together in a "circle," as it was called, at the head of which stood a zelator or zelatrix. Each circle was obliged to have a Mass offered up on given occasions, at which all the respective members must be present. It is probably an exaggeration when we read that certain circles gave as much as one thousand rubles for this Mass. The confraternity spread very rapidly. After scarcely one year's existence the membership was computed at half a million. Maria Francesca reserved to herself the headship of this branch of the organization. At her command the Mariavite priests refused to accept stole fees. This was a very sagacious step, as it made them immensely popular with the people. It must also be added that these priests lived rigidly poor and abstemious lives. Meat was absolutely forbidden them, and the more fervent amongst them lived the lives of vegetarians. They also were promoters of the cause of total abstinence from intoxicants. A very lucrative traffic in devotional articles soon developed amongst the clergy. Chief amongst these devotions was the so-called "Marian Communion," which was nothing else than the swallowing of a small piece of paper bearing a print of Our Lady of Perpetual Help. So popular had devotion to Our Lady under this invocation become in a short time that the Mariavite priests, without so much as a voice of opposition from the people, removed all images of the saints from the churches, not even sparing those of Our Lady of Czenstochowa. The members of the confraternity now began to wear publicly, as their distinctive insignia, a medal on one side of which a Host was engraved and on the other Our Lady of Perpetual Help. From the sale of these and other objects of devotion the priests soon amassed an enormous wealth. Despite the verbal prohibition of the Russian Government, a large strip of land was purchased in Plozk, on which soon arose a convent, in which vestments were embroidered or repaired under the eyes of the Mateczka. The contingent of Mariavites at Warsaw contributed the furniture for the convent, which was of the most gorgeous kind. The private apartments of Maria Francesca gave no indications of poverty.

With the year 1904 the second period of the Mariavites begins. As was to be expected, the conduct of the innovators aroused grave fears and misgivings amongst the clergy who had not been infected with the new teachings. The absolute subjection of the clergy to a woman gave special cause for complaint. When the Papal encyclical of 1902, on the Holy Eucharist, appeared, the Mariavite priest, Leo Golebiowska, forthwith translated it after his own fashion into

the vernacular. His version of the Papal document was made to read as a formal and authoritative approbation of the teaching and practices of the new organization. The Bishop of Plozk, Mgr. Szembek, at once ordered a minute investigation of the movement by competent hands. Kosłowska and Gobeliewski, who had been chosen to defend the Mariavites and set forth their teaching, were carefully interrogated by the two episcopal delegates. A full report of the entire process was forwarded to Rome. The Mateczka, accompanied by several of her priests, proceeded to the Eternal City, where Kowalska acted as spokesman. A letter from Father Honorat approving the new society was circulated in Rome until it was discovered to have been forged. The Holy Office, having thoroughly searched into the matter, declared the visions of Maria Francesca to be hallucinations, and commanded all priests to sever connections with her. With a genuine spirit of Jansenistic submission, the Mateczka declared that she renounced her authority over the priests and pious women whom she had won to her views; that she would desist completely from extending the movement; that she would look upon her visions as deceptions; that she would hand over her writings to the Bishop and accept the priest whom he would designate as her confessor. The priests who had done great work to further the society, Czerwinski, Zbirochowicz and Wiechowicz, also promised to withdraw. But the first named of the three wrote a letter to Kozłowska in December, 1905—although he had that very same month promised the Bishop to break entirely with her—full of words of encouragement to go on with the task, despite all obstacles and opposition.

Mgr. Wnukowski, who had succeeded to the see on the death of Mgr. Szembek, having settled by a court of inquiry that false theological views and an extravagant asceticism were to be found amongst the Mariavites, condemned them in September, 1905. At once all the leaders affected by this condemnation promised to submit without reserve. In secret, however, they began to agitate against the Bishop. Golebiowska's garbled translation of the Papal Encyclical on the Eucharist was adduced as a confirmation of their action. They also declared to have received another Papal letter, in which all the clergy who did not make common cause with them were reprehended in no unmistakable terms. Again the Bishop ordered an investigation. Having discovered downright heretical teaching amongst them, he summoned the leaders to appear before a council of the Bishops on February 8, 1906. Przyjemski and Rytel handed the assembled prelates a written document, in which the Mariavites solemnly declared their break with Rome. The step had been long contemplated, for the Mariavite priests had long

since recognized the authority of the Pope alone in their regard. Kowalska and Przyjemski hastened to Rome. They demanded that the Pope or Holy Office publish a document to this effect: "Maria Francesca was created a saint by God. She is the mother of mercy for all who have been called to eternal life by God. The Mariavite priests have received the express command from God to spread devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and Our Lady of Perpetual Help throughout the world, all canonical prescriptions and all ecclesiastical or civil opposition notwithstanding." Pius X. received the two priests most fatherly, and they promised him obedience and submission. They also promised in writing to submit to God's will as manifested in the direction of the Holy Father; they also promised to obey their Ordinaries. But no sooner had they returned to their own than they began to preach that the Pope had released them from all obedience to their Bishops; had approved their teachings and desired them to go on with their practices. Furthermore, they stated that Cardinal Vannutelli had advised them to gather all possible documentary evidence in order to undertake a process for the deposition of all priests and Bishops who were not of their manner of thinking.

And immediately Maria Francesca named Kowalska Archbishop!

Cardinal Vannutelli forthwith denied the words which these two unscrupulous men had put into his mouth. On April 5, 1906, the Pope addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Warsaw, as also to the Bishops of Plozk and Lublin, in which the condemnation of the Mariavites of September 5, 1904, was renewed and emphasized.

The innovators were now forced to come out into the open and declare outright what course of action they proposed to follow with regard to the Papal utterance. Kowalska, in a circular letter to his clergy, put down in brief the leading doctrines of the sect. It reads as follows:

"The Mariavites believe:

"(1) All that the Catholic Church teaches.

"(2) That God created Maria Francesca Kozłowska very holy and gave her the same graces which the Blessed Virgin and Mother of God received.

"(3) That mercy, as in fact the whole world, are in the hands of St. Maria Francesca, so that no one can obtain grace without her help and intercession.

"(4) That prayers to St. Maria Francesca are not only useful, but also necessary to withstand the assaults of Satan and to strengthen the soul in grace.

"Whoever believes all this is a true Mariavite.

"If the Mariavites form the minority of a parish, they must re-

linquish the parish church, retaining, however, the right to use the mortuary chapel in the cemetery. The Catholics may select their own pastor and make use of the parish church and parish house without any molestation on our part.

"But if the Mariavites constitute even less than one-third part of a given parish, the Catholics can lay no claim even to the mortuary chapel, but must come to an agreement with us, so as to be able to build their own chapel for themselves.

"Children under the age of fourteen must practice the religion of their parents; when they have reached the age of fourteen they can settle the matter of their religion for themselves.

"Given from Sobtdka, Aqril 13, 1906."

The dogmatic evolution of the Mariavites went on apace every day. Thus they soon began to teach that the visions of Maria Francesca were one of the sources of the doctrine of the Church. She was the spouse of Christ, and celebrates her mystic espousals with Christ at given times in heaven, and the feast lasts three weeks. Archbishop Kowalska was permitted once to be present at the feast. The Angel Gabriel announced to Maria Francesca that she was to become the mother of Antichrist. This caused her irrepressible pain. Recovering from her faint, she learned the will of God and submitted with the words: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord." Antichrist was born of her, having at his birth the age of three and one half or four years and possessing all his teeth. The extreme length to which a sickly neuroticism may reach may best be seen from the litany which all Mariavites recite in church before the image of St. Maria Francesca:

Holy Mary, Mother of God, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, spouse of Christ, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, mother of mercy, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, model of humility, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, model of virgins, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, foundress of the Mariavites, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, true adorer of the Blessed Sacrament, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, who poureth forth thy glory, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, who beareth all injuries, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, defamed in journals, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, torn by the tongues of men, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, victrix over Satan, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, true medicine against temptations, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, ignored and forgotten by the world, Pray for us.

By thy sufferings, Obtain us grace from God.
By thy great obedience to God, Obtain us grace from God.
By thy humility and patience, Obtain us grace from God.
By thy true spirit of sacrifice, Obtain us grace from God.
By thy adoration of the true God, Obtain us grace from God.
By thy enlightened obedience, Obtain us grace from God.
That we may glorify Thee with Maria Francesca, We beseech
Thee, O God.
That we may remain her sons, We beseech Thee, O God.
That we may not neglect the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament,
We beseech Thee, O God.

Let us pray:

O holy Maria Francesca, spouse of Jesus Christ, obtain for us from
God the grace to behold Him together with thee, forever and
forever. Amen.

These reformers of Catholicism seek to purify the faith by following the example of their neighbors, the Russians, who have always been lucky enough to discover new Christs and new Madonnas! But this exaltation and canonization of the Mateczka at the hands of her own had become necessary for the extension of the sect. At the hour of their rupture with Rome the Mariavites could boast of fifty priests, amongst whom were seven doctors of theology and nearly half a million faithful. At the end of 1907 Professor Jesipow, who had gone to great trouble to make an accurate census, put down their total numbers at seventy thousand. The reason of this rapid decline lay, in great part, in the civil trial which the Mateczka invited. It came about thus: Nawroki, editor of the widely circulated "Niedziela," wrote one day early in 1907 to this effect: "The Mateczka, who has just finished a visitation of her diocese, led, up to a short time ago, the life of an adventuress. Meanwhile she has grown tired of this manner of life, and is trying to expiate her past faults by an ascetical life." Now, Maria Francesca grew wrath at once, because her own accepted the holiness of her life as one of the basic doctrines of the movement. She was of the opinion that no one knew of her past doings, or else would not have the courage to speak against her now that she was the ideal and more of her people. Hence she sued Nawroki for libel. The latter brought forward as witnesses the Rev. Peter Dzieniakowski, a man over sixty years of age, and the laymen Adam Koszntski and Szyling. The Mariavite priests Golebiowska and Prochniewicz and the pious women, or Mariavite nuns, Bronisz, Myga and Dembowska rallied to the defense of the Mateczka. In the very first stage of the process Maria Francesca perjured herself in declaring that none of her witnesses were relatives. It

was soon shown, however, that Bronisz was her aunt. Despite this unpropitious beginning, the witnesses were loud in proclaiming the holiness of the Mateczka's life. In the afternoon quite other evidence was brought forward, showing the loose morals of her past life. The jury, after deliberating not quite ten minutes, rendered a verdict in favor of Nowraki. It was a severe blow to the Mariavite movement, and opened the eyes of the simple-minded to the true character of the much-vaunted saint more effectively than the Papal condemnation. The absurd honors paid to Maria Francesca by her followers are but a desperate effort to save her good name and rehabilitate her before the world. It was absolutely necessary to canonize the Mateczka after the trial if she was longer to be foisted upon the people as the chosen instrument of God. The popular daily journal, "Nowoje Wremia," acceded to a proposal of the Mariavite leaders to undertake a systematic campaign of advertising the virtues of Maria Francesca. To the same end several Mariavite priests wrote a brochure⁶ which swarms not only with the vilest attacks upon the Church and her ministers, but is full of the most patent caviling and twisting of moral principles in favor of the society. Even Lehmkuhl is made to do service to the cause. The book was intended for popular use, and may justly be looked upon as the Mariavite laymen's official handbook of moral theology. As a sample of the conclusions at which these skulking theologians arrive, we will quote only one sentence: "Mariavite laymen who receive absolution from Mariavite priests who have been excommunicated receive an increase of divine grace, and do not commit a sin thereby as do orthodox Catholics. This assertion of ours is an incontestable truth."⁷ At the same time the leaders sought and readily obtained a guarantee of protection from the Russian Government. With the native Muscovite hatred of all things Roman, the civil authorities at St. Petersburg on December 11, 1906, officially recognized the society as a legalized organization.

The Mariavites found a man after their own hearts in the Russian general, Alexander Kirecv, who had spent many years of his life in trying to bring about a union of the moribund Old Catholics with the Greek Orthodox Church. This military theologian advised the Mariavites to draw the last conclusions of their teachings, which would be nothing else than to constitute themselves a national church. Thus they would also insure their future existence, becoming, politically, part of the Russian Established Church. With the approval of the Mateczka, Kowalska proceeded

⁶ Mariavity: oproverjenie lojnh slukhow o Mariavitakh. Lodz, 1908.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 110.

to Utrecht for episcopal consecration at the hands of the Jansenist Bishop.* Others took the road to Switzerland for ordination. At the Convention of the Old Catholics at Vienna in September, 1908, the Mariavites subscribed to the following fundamental doctrines of the Old Catholic Church:

(1) The Mariavite priests recognize as Sacred Scripture all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.

(2) They accept the Catholic criterion of the primitive Church "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est," a criterion which permits them to accept historically the true dogmas and to distinguish them from the theological speculations which cannot be imposed in conscience.

(3) They accept the episcopal and synodal constitution of the Universal Church and the disciplinary, liturgical and administrative autonomy of particular churches.

(4) They profess the Creed sanctioned by the Councils of Nice and Constantinople and accepted by the Universal Church, and they accept the dogmatic definitions of the œcumenic councils of 431, 451, 553, 681, 787.

(5) They admit the seven sacraments as these are exposed and interpreted in Holy Scripture and in the universal tradition of the first eight centuries.

(6) They reject, as contrary to Scripture and tradition, the institution of the modern Papacy, which was developed especially in the Western Councils of Lateran, Trent and the Vatican.

Conformable with this programme the Mariavites began to teach that there is only one head of the Church, the invisible head, Jesus Christ; that the Church is divided into national and autonomous churches; that Christian unity consists in the bond of charity; that there is no superior and infallible judge in matters of faith; that the ideal church is the Dutch Jansenistic Church. For the Popes had corrupted the doctrine of Christianity on grace—hence the Bulls of Innocent X. and Clement XI. are monstrous impositions on the faithful; hence, too, the religious of Port Royal were heroes of the purity of the faith. Frequent confession is not necessary, since Holy Communion remits mortal sin. Indulgences must be rejected, because no man has the power of attributing the fruit of good works to the souls of the deceased. The Immaculate Conception is not to be admitted as a dogma, because it was not defined by an œcumenic council. The celibacy of the clergy is not obligatory, because a legitimate marriage is to be preferred

* P. Petrouchevsky: Vstuplenie mariavitov v soizn s staro-katolikami i posviachtenie pervago mariavitskago episkopa, in "Rukovodstvo dlia seisk, pastyrei," Kiev 28-29; 238-257; 270-277.

to concubinage. The unity of the Church does not demand the absolute identity of opinions and theological doctrines. The chief obligation of the Mariavite is daily adoration of the Blessed Sacrament at a fixed hour. The accepted formula on this head of Mariavite dogma is: "Above all things else, pray—the rest will take care of itself." The Mariavites vindicated their right to perform all liturgical acts in the Polish language. These tenets of the Mariavite heresy are to be found in the official textbook of dogma which the leaders published at Lodz in 1910 as a reply to a series of articles in which the professor of the Seminary at Plozk, Adolf Szelazek, attacked the theological statements and pretensions of Kowalska.⁹

According to the Mariavite Calendar of 1911 the sect to-day can boast of ninety parishes in the Provinces of Kalisz, Lomza, Piotokov, Plozk, Radom, Siedlic, Suvalsk, Warsaw, Gradno, Kiev, Kovno, Wilna. They are governed by three Bishops, the Minister General, Michael Kowalska; the Vicar General, Romano Prochniewski, and Leo Golebiowska. Thirty-one priests minister to one hundred thousand adepts. The clergy wear a gray cassock, on the breast of which an ostensorium is embroidered, and go about in sandals. The clergy is very active in conducting primary, evening, normal and industrial schools. All forms of social activity are carried on by the priests. Skolimowski is editor of two journals which appear at Lodz. The "Maryavita" appeared at first weekly in sixteen pages; since January, 1911, it appears monthly in sixty-four pages. The "Mariawitische Nachrichten," which appeared at first twice each week, has been changed into a tri-weekly. The Mariavites possess no seminary or novitiate for the education of their clergy. After having studied theology and ecclesiastical discipline in the house of a pastor, the aspirant to the priesthood goes up for ordination. The leaders of the sect have divided up the world into provinces according to the various nationalities. Thus a Dutch, French, German, Russian and English province are next contemplated as fields for the proselyting zeal of the Mariavite clergy.

This is in brief outline a history of the birth and evolution of a heresy which has wrought great havoc in a Catholic land. The Mariavite heresy has not the saving quality of originality. Dogmatically, it is a synthesis of the errors of the Jansenists and Old Catholics, with a few exaggerated and extravagant ascetical ideas and practices thrown in for good measure. In organization it is a hopeless mixture of the Catholic concepts of the hierarchy and monastic orders. The whole organism is tainted with a re-

⁹ Wobronie zasad ewangelii: czesc I., dogmatyczna. Lodz, 1910, page 190.

volting neuroticism. Maria Francesca may well serve as the patron saint of highly developed religious suffragettes. If the heresy has succeeded so far, it is because the clergy profess piety and mortification and has turned to its own ends the revived devotion to the Holy Eucharist manifest throughout the world to-day. Many a day will pass before the heresy is driven out of Poland, for it has worked its way into popular favor. And in the meantime its leaders, who are shrewd, unscrupulous men who know how to make use of the press, are planning a conquest of those Catholic emigrants from the fatherland who have settled abroad and are living in the diaspora.

HILDEBRAND VAN AMSTEL, O. P.

THOMAS DWIGHT.

TOWARD the end of the year 1907 there came to me, with the author's autograph and his Christmas greetings, a copy of "A Clinical Atlas of Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet," by Thomas Dwight, M. D., LL. D., Parkman professor of anatomy at the Harvard Medical School. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1907.) The volume was one of the important scientific contributions to anatomy made in America. It had been made possible first by the magnificent collection of variations and anomalies of the bones of the hands and feet, probably the best of its kind in the world, which Professor Dwight had made for the Warren Museum of Harvard University during the quarter of a century while, with all the resources of the Harvard anatomical department at his command, he had taken special interest in the subject. Its value was, moreover, greatly enhanced by the many X-ray pictures of the extremities, and especially of the wrists and ankles, which had been made in difficult surgical cases at the Massachusetts General Hospital during the decade since the introduction of that very useful auxiliary to surgical diagnosis. These two sets of studies had shown the practical value of such knowledge and made it clear that even the supposedly rarer variations and anomalies were not infrequently involved in injuries of the hands and feet. In many a lesion called a sprain there was really a break of a bone or a dislocation not readily recognizable because the conditions present originally in the bones and the joints of these complex structures were not those usually set down as the normal

anatomy at the Harvard Medical School. (Philadelphia and London anatomy of the parts. On the other hand, many a suspected fracture was only an anomalous condition quite normal for the individual in question.

For those not familiar with the details of human anatomy it may be well to say that while men and women resemble one another quite closely in their structures, according to their respective sexes, this resemblance is not carried into details. There is no closer similarity of structure between any two individuals in any part of the body than there is in human faces. These are all different, in spite of some near resemblances, and most of them are quite strikingly and individually different. We make composite pictures which show what is the average normal type of face of certain races and peoples, but this does not necessarily resemble any individual very closely, and may depart from it very widely in certain features. Just in the same way the text-books of anatomy present what is the average plan of human structures, muscle and nerve and bone and their divisions, but probably any particular individual will deviate from this more or less in any given portion of his body. The more complex that human structures are, as in the neighborhood of the face, where the muscles of expression and the presence of the teeth and the eyes and the nose complicate the conditions of the tissues, the more likely is the individual anatomy to depart from the normal beneath the skin as well as on the surface. Just this same thing is true, though in a somewhat less degree, in the hands and feet, which are such intricate combinations of bone and soft tissue. Professor Dwight's book, then, on "The Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet," while appealing more particularly to the scientific anatomist, had a definite practical value, and was welcomed by careful, diligent surgeons as enabling them to explain many surgical conditions which had puzzled them before.

Probably the most interesting feature for me of the copy of the book as sent by its author was that it contained the well-known prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas, beginning "Creator ineffabilis," which so many Catholic scholars have used for centuries since St. Thomas' time at the commencement of any intellectual labor. It was not long after the reception of the book that I came to know at first hand how much its author thought of Aquinas, and how thoroughly he had devoted himself to the study of the great mediæval schoolman, whose combination of scientific information, obtained from his great investigating teacher, Albertus Magnus, with the philosophy of the Greeks, and especially of Aristotle, had enabled him to make a cosmic philosophy—I might rather say a

philosophy of the universe—that has probably never been equaled for its completeness or the thoroughness with which it responds to all the difficult problems of life.

At the moment, however, it seemed at least unusual that a distinguished scientific anatomist of the modern time should be so devout a disciple of the great mediæval schoolman. It was not alone that the oft-quoted maxim, more partial in its truth than most maxims, that where there are three physicians there are two atheists, would seem to negative such a combination, but, besides, there was the supposed skeptical effect of his specialty of anatomy. For he had been most interested in variations and anomalies in human anatomy, and these, because of the support they are at least claimed to furnish to the theory of evolution as applied to man's body as well as of that of the animals, are presumed by many scientific men of our time to have rendered faith in the great teachings of Christianity as regards creation quite impossible for scientific minds at least. It could scarcely fail to seem strange and almost impossible, then, to find a devout client of St. Thomas Aquinas in the person of the Parkman professor of anatomy at Harvard, one of the world's best authorities on variations and anomalies, and, with the exception of Professor Leidy, perhaps the most distinguished contributor to anatomical science that America has produced.

Before this I had known Professor Dwight from casual meetings at medical societies, but after this I had the privilege of a precious personal acquaintance with him and the pleasure of meeting him on a number of occasions, and of learning to know this chosen soul whose work in the medical sciences meant so much, yet whose simple-hearted devotion to Catholic practice made him noteworthy among his fellows. I had, besides, the valued honor of an introduction to his family circle, and of an acquaintance with those near and dear to him who shared so thoroughly in his faith. At a distance I was permitted, through his letters, to watch with compassionate interest how for more than two years he passed through the valley of the shadow of death with such unmoved Christian trustfulness that few of those who met him from day to day had any idea how seriously ill he was, though, being a physician, it could not be hidden from him, least of all by himself, that, at most, the inevitable fatal termination was but a few months off. Perhaps this much of acquaintance, beginning some twelve years ago, may justify my attempt to tell American Catholics something of the life of the man, a descendant of an old New England family, who in the breaking up of Protestantism found peace and consolation in the bosom of the old Church.

Thomas Dwight was the son of Thomas Dwight, of the old New England family of Dwight, and of Mary Collins (Warren) Dwight, granddaughter of John Warren, a brother of the General Warren who fell at Bunker Hill, and who, it will be recalled by those who still remember details of American history, was a physician. Together with his first cousin on his mother's side, Dr. John Collins Warren, a distinguished surgeon, Dr. Dwight represented the third generation by direct descent of an illustrious line of Boston physicians. He was born in Boston, October 13, 1843, and received his early education in Boston. He entered Harvard in the class of 1866, but did not complete the college course. In the meantime a very important factor had come into his life. When he was about twelve his mother became a convert to Catholicity, and he became a Catholic at the same time. How deep was his attachment to the Church which he thus entered as a growing boy all his after life attests.

He entered the Harvard Medical School in 1865, and received his degree of doctor of medicine in 1867. Our medical courses in America at that time are memorable mainly for their compendiousness. Dr. Dwight proceeded to enlarge his medical education by European study. Altogether, he spent two years abroad attending the regular surgical and medical clinics of Berlin, and particularly Vienna, but, in addition, he made special studies in anatomy for some months under Rüdinger at Munich. Rüdinger was attracting attention particularly by his study of the relations of human organs by means of sections of frozen bodies. As we shall see a little later, Dr. Dwight introduced this important method of anatomical study and teaching into America, and did some work on it that attracted attention and that has been referred to as a landmark in the history of this form of anatomical investigation.

On his return Dr. Dwight took up the practice of medicine in Boston and at Nahant, where he spent his summers for many years. He did not become deeply immersed in practice, however, and his tastes were rather for medical science than the practical art. It is not surprising, then, to find him in 1872 and 1873 the instructor in comparative anatomy at Harvard. In the meantime, however, he had devoted himself to rounding out what he thought defective in his preliminary education, and so we are told in 1872 of his receiving his degree of A. B. from Harvard. Serious study soon tells, and his work began to attract attention. In 1873 he was offered the chair of professor of anatomy at Bowdoin College, Maine. The instruction in the anatomical department of that institution was given intensively, and did not require his absence from Boston

except during a comparatively short time each year. He continued his connection with Harvard, occupying the position of instructor in histology.

During his earlier years of teaching at Harvard Professor Dwight kept in touch with the practical work of surgery, and doubtless his anatomical teaching benefited by this practical experience. There is always the danger that the theoretic scientist may become so much interested in science for its own sake that he forgets that he must teach young men whose principal interest in science is its practical applications. Nowhere is this more true than in the department of anatomy. Professor Dwight's surgical career, though brief, was, while it lasted, very active. He was visiting surgeon at the Carney Hospital from 1876 to 1883. He was surgeon to the outpatient department of the Boston City Hospital from 1877 to 1880. He was afterwards on the Board of Consultants of the Carney Hospital and for a time president of the staff. He realized, too, that his special anatomical knowledge might well be of interest to the public, and in 1884 he delivered a course of lectures at the Lowell Institute on "The Mechanism of Bone and Muscle," and in 1899 another course on "The Significance of Variations in the Human Body."

In 1883 he succeeded Oliver Wendell Holmes as professor of anatomy. The Boston *Transcript* just after Professor Dwight's death—and the *Transcript* is usually considered to voice Harvard University sentiment—said: "Dwight's election to the chair of anatomy at the Medical School was one of the most important in the history of that institution; it came just at the right time for him and for it." Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes had been an excellent teacher of anatomy, in spite of his own expression that his professorship had been a display of "incapacity, tempered with epigrams." He had so many other interests, however, that, though, in the words of a colleague, "no one could clothe the dry bones of anatomy with more interest," anatomical science as such was not pursued with the singleness of purpose and thoroughgoing devotion that it deserves and demands. "The appointment, then," to continue the quotation from the editorial in the *Transcript*, "really meant the transmission of the anatomical department to the dominance of a man possessed of thorough and accurate knowledge of his specialty and of quite unusual organizing talent. The Medical School felt soon enough that there was a new and firmer hand at that particular wheel." Dwight's work had already attracted wide attention, but now, from his prominent position, it came to be one of the stimulating factors in the pursuit of medical science in this country.

Dr. Dwight, then, had his professorship, his special anatomical

work and his life as a citizen of Boston before him for a quarter of a century. The world knows the story of his professorship through his students, who are medical teachers and practicing physicians all over the country. It knows what he accomplished in his anatomical rooms through his written work. His life as a practical Christian, deeply influencing those around him in his own generation, is largely hidden, except from those who were intimate with him. To know the man, however, one must have the more important details at least of the three phases of his life before one. It is this, though quite inadequately, mainly from lack of time, partly from lack of space, that I shall try to present here. I am sorry that the work has not fallen to some one who knew Professor Dwight better. Besides the advantage of personal acquaintance with him, however, I had the privilege of such help from his family and intimate friends as made it possible to gather many details not generally known. My admiration for the man may make up in some degree for the incompleteness of my knowledge of his life and work for a proper presentation of it to the public.

Professor Dwight's first important contribution to medical literature was made under the title "The Intracranial Circulation." So much in medicine depends on the circulation of blood through the brain that the importance of the subject can be readily realized. This paper won what is known as the Boylston prize in 1867—that is, the prize offered by the Boylston Medical Society, of Boston, each year for the best paper on a subject related to medicine sent in to the society under certain conditions. It was published by the Cambridge University Press the same year. The essays submitted for the competition have to be handed in without any name or means of identification attached to them other than a maxim, which is enclosed in a sealed envelope with the author's name within. The motto chosen by Dwight with characteristic modesty was a citation from Sir Thomas Brown's "Vulgar Errors:—" "In this work attempts will exceed performances."

His next paper was a description of the whale in the collection of the Boston Society of Natural History, published in 1873. Then came his little volume on the anatomy of the head of the child, illustrated by frozen sections, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. in 1872. ("Frozen Sections of a Child.")

This was a ground-breaking work in its line in America. It is, of course, of no interest to any one but those who are occupied with anatomical or surgical subjects. The professor of anatomy at St. Louis University Medical School, however, in his recent important work on serial sections calls attention to the fact that Professor

Dwight's study was the first of its kind made in this country, and eminently suggestive and valuable. It is typical of much of Professor Dwight's works. Practically always what he did was original, and he seldom took up the work of others with the idea of gaining easy prestige by slight additions of interest for the moment. This little book attracted much attention among anatomists and those who were interested in the study of children from a scientific standpoint.

An excursion into another field besides anatomy, though with eminent need of anatomical knowledge for its completion, was his essay on "The Identification of the Human Skeleton," a medico-legal study to which was awarded the prize of the Massachusetts Medical Society for 1878. It was published by Clapp in Boston this same year. Dwight made a number of interesting observations and collected a large amount of valuable material for the essay. He demonstrated by personal measurements of a number of specimens, very carefully made, that the long bones of the body were not always of exactly or nearly equal length on both sides. Sometimes the femur, the long bone of the thigh, was longer by half an inch in one leg than the corresponding bone of the other side. Sometimes this was made up for in the length of the leg by the presence of a shorter tibia, the main bone of the lower leg, on the same side, but occasionally both femur and tibia of one leg were markedly longer than those of the other. He found the same thing to be true for a number of other bones, and asymmetry rather than symmetry was the rule in most human skeletons when carefully studied. The practical importance of such observations for surgeons who have to set broken bones, and who must depend on measurements to guide them, can be readily appreciated. Besides the notable differences in the length of the bones of the legs were of help to understand individual peculiarities of gait and station.

After this his papers have less of popular, but much more of scientific interest. His paper on "The Sternum as an Index of Sex and Age" appeared in the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* for 1880. In 1894 Clapp published his Shattuck lecture on "The Range and Significance of Variation in Human Skeletons." More and more this came to be his special subject. In the *American Naturalist* for 1895 appeared his paper on "The Significance of Anomalies," and in the *Anatomische Anzeiger*, the well-known German anatomical journal, for the same year appeared his "Statistics of Variations, With Remarks on the Use of Such Data in Anthropology."

One of his colleagues who knew him best and who had followed his work closely summed up some of his scientific achievements in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* for September 21, 1911.

Perhaps what he accomplished may not seem much to those who are not familiar with the significance of his discoveries, not only for practical surgery, but for comparative anatomy. It is such detailed studies that enable us to control theoretic considerations and conclusions that seem to be indicated by a few observations, yet often are contradicted, or at least considerably modified, when an adequate number of observations can be made. Very little work like his has been done in America. We need more of this attention to detail which has been so characteristic of German medical research. Our modern biological sciences have been seriously hampered in their progress by jumping to conclusions of interesting theory that proved subsequently not to be justified by realities. We need an immense accumulation of data for this, and Dr. Dwight not only did his share nobly in beginning it, but the incentive that he provided will set many another investigator carefully at work. His biographer in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* said:

"Dr. Dwight took a special interest in the development of the anatomical part of the museum of the Medical School and in the use of its collection for research and teaching purposes. As a result of his efforts the anatomical collections were greatly extended and arranged on a very practical basis. He devoted much time to this work, especially in the last years of his life, and it was his hope to have been able to leave the collections so arranged as to show the normal anatomy and normal variations of all parts of the body. The work of the skeleton had been thoroughly done, and he had made progress with the vascular system and some of the organs when increasing weakness compelled him to stop. As a result of his labors the osteological collection is one of the best in existence, the normal variations of all the chief bones being beautifully shown. This is especially true of the collection of human spines, on which he spent much time and wrote several monographs. These illustrate practically all possible numerical variations in the various parts of the spine, and are practically unique. His collections of variations of the hand and foot deserve special mention. He discovered and described for the first time two cases of the presence of a new occasional bone—the intercuneiform bone in the foot—and the presence of the subcapitatum as a distinct bone in both hands. In the last two years of his life, when he knew he was suffering from a hopeless disease, it gave him great satisfaction to find and describe a specimen of a secondary cuboid bone in one foot, which had been seen only once before by any anatomist, and shortly after a similar case of the same bone occurring in both feet at the same time—an absolutely unique case. These two monographs, together with another on

variations of the first rib and costal elements of the neck, represent his last contributions to anatomical literature. He also made a very fine series of corrosion preparations of various kinds for the museum."

Professor Dwight's collection of bones to illustrate variations and anomalies, as it may be seen in the Warren Museum of Anatomy in the new buildings at Harvard, is most interesting even for those not especially addicted to anatomy. Physicians are well aware of the great variety of anomalies that have been found, but few of them realize how frequent these are and how widely some of them depart from what is called the normal condition that is the most frequent morphologic status of the part. There are a series illustrating nearly every form of diversion from the average condition. A typical illustration, taken almost at random, will suffice to represent what will be found there. In the upper part of the scapula, the bone popularly known as the shoulder blade, there is usually found a groove for the passage of the nerve to the group of rather important muscles that move this bone. This groove is sometimes rather shallow, sometimes it is quite deep, sometimes its edges approach so close together above the deep groove as to constitute almost a hole, or foramen, as it is technically called. Sometimes it is a complete foramen that permits the passage of the nerve. This state is found in certain animals normally. Sometimes nature, apparently forgetting that she has already made a foramen for the passage of the nerve, makes a groove above it, so that there is both a foramen and a groove, though the nerve passes through the foramen as a rule. In Professor Dwight's collection are to be found scapulæ representing all these conditions, from a shallow to a deep groove, and then a groove that is almost a foramen; finally a foramen, and then both groove and foramen in the same specimen.

It would be very easy, of course, to conclude that very little of practical value for medicine could be derived from such detailed studies of anomalous conditions. Anomalies are rather rare events, and there are so many of them that it would be very difficult to know them all, and the physician and surgeon must depend on his knowledge of the normal average man and cannot be expected to be familiar with peculiar conditions special to a very few individuals. Professor Dwight in the preface to his book on "Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet" has answered this very simply and effectively, and has called attention to the fact, of course, that it is exactly the careful expert individualization of treatment that constitutes the real success of the physician or surgeon. The practitioner of medicine is not called to treat an average human being, but a

definite individual with whatever peculiarities that may be present. We know now, of course, that progress in medicine consists just in this individualization. We do not treat typhoid fever nor pneumonia, but particular individuals suffering from these diseases. Each case is a special problem by itself, requiring special study. Just in the same way surgical conditions of the hands and feet require such special study, and to assume that it is an average normal individual who is under treatment is to ignore the knowledge of special peculiarities and their significance in such conditions as they have come to be known in recent years.

Professor Dwight said: "The constantly increasing use of the X-ray has shown that the study of variations is not a scientific fad, but a matter of very great practical importance. Not only are the ordinary variations (still but little known to the surgeon) constantly appearing, but very uncommon ones are occasionally seen. In fact, the number of hands and feet examined by the X-ray is so much greater than that of those seen *post-mortem* by anatomists that it is not surprising that variations thought excessively rare should repeatedly be brought to light.

"For many years I have devoted myself to the study of variations in man, especially to those of the spine and of the bones of the hand and foot. The importance of these in the practice of surgery becomes clearer day by day. This atlas has been prepared for the use of the practitioner. Some variations are discussed which are of interest to the orthopædist, but attention has been given chiefly to those which may be expected to appear in skiagraphs taken after an injury, and which may suggest a fracture to the unwary."

Something of the meaning of these detailed investigations into variations of the bones of the hands and feet may be gathered from even a slight consideration of the bones of the wrist and the variants in number and form that are found in particular individuals. The wrist is said normally to consist of eight bones. At least double this number, however, have been found in various subjects, if the possibilities of division and separation among these through embryonic disturbances are taken into account. The larger bones may occur in two parts, and some of their processes may remain separated quite apart from injury, or may not have grown together originally, and as a consequence when some injury happens later in life the X-rays may show a condition quite different to the average normal, and yet perfectly normal for that individual. All these possibilities need to be known by the surgeon in these cases to prevent him from thinking a special form of fracture has occurred or that processes of healing are not taking place because he finds separation between bones where

ordinarily such separations do not occur. It is probably that Professor Dwight's atlas of these variations and anomalies has been of the greatest practical help to surgeons since the introduction of the X-rays made possible the more careful study of conditions.

Such studies, of course, can only be pursued by the specialists, and even then only by one who has ample facilities for travel, opportunities for study and such recognition as enables him to devote himself to his task wherever he wishes. In the study of variations in bones, for instance, for the determination of a single point, which he discusses in his paper, "The Significance of the Third Trochanter and of Similar Bony Processes in Man," published in the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology*, Volume XXIV., 1889, Professor Dwight examined skeletons at the Army Medical Museum, International Museum at Washington, at the Hunterian Museum in London, besides the collections close at hand in Peabody Museum, Harvard. In his investigations he examined both thigh bones of seventy-four skeletons from the Tennessee Stone Graves, making his researches represent the distant past as well as more recent times.

A time came when these patient, profound studies were to bear fruit, both from the scientific and the practical point of view. Professor Dwight came to be looked upon as one of the world authorities on variations and anomalies. This subject had attained a place of importance in biology because of the arguments which seemed to provide for the explanation of such phenomena as reversions to the animal types through which man in his descent had passed—it was so easy to use the word reversion whenever an anomalous condition in man could be found in animals, and there was little thought of the necessity for studying out carefully such relations from a scientific standpoint. Professor Dwight did this, and his conclusions were quite at variance with those reached by hasty students, who, knowing little about the subject, were, as is usually the case, ready to draw all the wider conclusions. To him the reversion principle seemed a contradiction of many obvious scientific observations. He wrote a series of papers on this subject, and when, at the end of his life, he wrote his last testament of scientific opinion in his "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," he summed up much of what he had written for the benefit of non-technical readers, who would not be likely to have seen his conclusions and the reasons for them in the special scientific journals in which they had been published. Because of its place in biology in the question of evolution this subject came to be one of the most important in biological science, and Professor Dwight's long and patient studies made him one of the greatest authorities in it.

As he said himself: "The more anomalies we study, the less justification do we find for explaining them as reversions." Only the specialists, or at least one thoroughly familiar with the subject, can always appreciate the significance of such investigations, though nearly always even the rank outsider can catch the drift of the argument and, above all, realize how carefully the investigation has been made. A typical example that will illustrate this is to be found in Professor Dwight's discussion of the distinction between the bony skeleton of the lower portion of the nose in animals and in man. He has himself in his last book ("Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist") boiled down the paper on the "Fossa Prænasalis," published originally in the *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, February, 1892, so I prefer to quote it directly:

"The border at the lower opening of the cavity of the nose is usually in the human skull a sharp little ridge. In animals the lower border is, as a rule, rounded off, so that there is no sharp distinction between the inside of the nose and the front of the face. Occasionally in low human skulls this condition is found, and it is not absurd to call it a reversion; but very rarely there exists just below the entrance of the nose a little pit with sharply marked borders entirely different from the gutter-like form, called the fossa prænasalis. I have sought for this feature very carefully among the skulls of mammals without success, except in the seal tribe. There I have found it variously developed, and sometimes very well marked, notably in the harp seal, but I have not been able to study a large enough series to be sure that it is quite constant. I incline strongly, however, to believe that it may be said to be normal in this aberrant family of the carnivora. Will some one kindly tell me how man has reverted to the seal?"

Professor Dwight's opinion, thus emphatically expressed, is in contradiction to much of what was said with regard to variations and anomalies when these features of the human body were assumed to be so many evidences of the evolution of man from the animal. Whenever a structure was found that could, even by any stretch of the imagination, be presumed to be similar to a structure peculiar to an animal, this was assumed to be another argument in favor of the descent of man from animal species. Whenever the arrangement of human structures was anomalous in particular individuals, so that they recalled in any way the special arrangement of animal structures, this was proclaimed another proof of human descent. Professor Dwight, after all his careful studies on the subject, declares that while at first view variations and anomalies might seem to justify such a conclusion, deeper study and wider knowledge shows

very clearly that they do not. This is exactly what has happened with regard to other phases of the argument and evidences for human descent that have been urged with no little insistence during the last generation. We are now coming to realize that while superficial knowledge with regard to them made it apparent that they were proofs, or at least furnished evidence for descent, deeper knowledge has completely changed our view with regard to them.

A typical example, of course, is to be found in what concerns so-called useless organs in the human body. These were set down as vestigial remains of animal structures which were still maintained in the human body, though there were no longer any use for them, because they had existed in the previous stages of development and natural selection had not succeeded in obliterating them, though their obliteration is only a matter of time. It is curiously interesting now to go back and see how many structures were set down as useless even as late as 1880. The function of the spleen is unknown, and as it could be removed without killing the patient, even it was among the useless organs. Then there were the tonsils, various gland systems, the thyroid, the hypophysis cerebri and other structures. There are a very few of these that are now considered to be useless. Even the appendix, supposed to be the most irrefutable evidence of this kind, is no longer considered useless. It has a definite function, and while, like the spleen, it may be removed without killing the patient, it is probably much better for the generality of men that they have their appendixes. Anatomy and physiology have brought us to the very opposite extreme, and now we know that most organs in the human body have not only their manifest function, but often secondary functions, sometimes two or three in number, that are of great importance. The internal secretions of organs that have definite ducts are often more important than the secretion that passes through the duct. The ductless glands, formerly considered useless organs because our superficial acquaintance with them did not enable us to know much about them, are now counted among the most important structures in the body.

It is not surprising, then, that Professor Dwight should have found the same state of affairs with regard to variations and anomalies. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing even, or perhaps especially, in biology. It is dangerous in philosophy because it tempts people to draw conclusions that are not justified by wider knowledge. Biology is only the philosophy of life, and here once more the superficial knowledge leads astray. This has been quite as true in other phases of the Darwinian argument, as, for instance, with regard to so-called protective mimicry. Some natural selection

of animals, so as to make them assimilate to their surroundings for protective purposes there is, but the attempt to explain color generally in nature in this way has broken down completely. We have had some most amusing examples of how men permitted themselves to be led astray in this matter. With the significance of variations and anomalies gone, that of useless organs seriously diminished and that of protective mimicry rendered ridiculous in many respects, most of the arguments on which the acceptance of the theory of descent through natural selection is founded for the great majority of people have disappeared.

Professor Dwight does not refuse entirely to accept the theory of evolution, but he insists that as yet we have very little, indeed almost no definite evidence, though the tyranny of the *Zeitgeist*—of the spirit of the time—is such that most men give much more credence to it than is justified by the evidence afforded them. He quotes Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan, who said:

“But I venture to prophesy that if any one will undertake to question modern zoölogists and botanists concerning their relation to the Darwinian theory, he will find that, while professing in a general way to hold this theory, most biologists have many reservations and doubts, which they either keep to themselves or, at any rate, do not allow to interfere with the teaching of the Darwinian doctrine or with the applications which they make of it in their writings. The claim of the opponents of the theory that Darwinism has become a dogma contains more truth than the nominal followers of the school find pleasant to hear.”

Professor Dwight goes to the heart of the subject in a single rather long paragraph that deserves to be quoted in its entirety, because it sums up a distinguished present-day scientist's views with regard to the evidence for and against Darwinism (p. 44):

“Beyond question, just at the time when the uneducated are prating about the triumph of Darwinism, it is fast losing caste among men of science. After all, what has ever been established? What evidence have we of the gradual passing of one species into another? What has become of the intermediate forms, not indeed of those between any two given species, but of those between the hosts of species which must have in turn risen from lower and given origin to higher ones? Rudimentary and useless structures have been one of the strong points of Darwinism, but what do they show? First, that there are certain strong resemblances, dependent on unity of plan, between different species, indeed different orders and even different classes of animals; second, that there are, beyond any question, structures that are useless to the individual. Formerly these

were quoted as inheritances, degenerate representatives of structures of past usefulness, and in many cases this may be true. But Osborn tells us that his paleontological studies show that rudimentary structures—horns, for instance—appear in species which could not have inherited them, but which are themselves the ancestors of those who are to show these same structures in greater development. Nothing could be more fatal than this not only to Darwinism, but to any system of purposeless evolution. Hybrids are as sterile as they ever were. New species have failed to materialize. Artificial variations (unless fixed by the crossing of Mendel's 'dominants' with dominants, or of 'regressives' with regressives, of which Darwin knew nothing) still tend to revert to original conditions. Sexual selection, the theory according to which the best equipped males carry off females from their inferior neighbors, has not proved its claims. It is not certain that surviving species are always the best adapted to their surroundings. The theory has been most productive of loose reasoning. Morgan, referring to the Darwinian school, says very justly: 'To imagine that a certain organ is useful to its possessor, and to account for its origin because of the imagined benefit conferred, is the general procedure of the followers of this school' (p. 453). It has given rise, however, to worse than loose reasoning, for conclusions destructive of all morality, founded on quite imaginary premises, have been offered to the unwary."

Professor Dwight has pointed out the weakness of other systems of evolution quite as strikingly as Darwinism. "Upon Weismann's principle," he quotes Professor Osborn as saying: "We can explain inheritance, but not evolution, while with Lamarck's principle and Darwin's selection principle we can explain evolution, but not at present inheritance." Unless a theory of evolution can explain both evolution and inheritance, it cannot be scientifically accepted. Professor Dwight has something to say positively for evolution, though he considers that he can say that best in quotations from a distinguished Catholic priest—a Jesuit scientist—whose work in one department of biology has attracted wide attention, and who has won for himself the right to be heard on this subject. Professor Dwight says (p. 54):

"The opinion of Rev. Eric Wasmann, S. J., whose studies on ants, wasps and bees have placed him high among scientists, is well worth quoting in this connection. He is convinced that the doctrine of evolution is not at variance with the Christian theory of life, and in no other way can he account for certain facts. The interest of the following quotation must be the excuse for its length:

"I wish to draw your attention to the fact that accommodation to

the life of ants and white ants, or termites, has in all probability led to the formation of new *species*, *genera* and *families* among their guests, which belong to very various families and orders of insects. In many cases (*Thaumatoxena*) the characteristic marks have been so completely altered by accommodation that it is scarcely possible for us to determine to which order of insects this strange creature belongs. In other cases (*Termitomyia*) the whole development of the individual is modified in such a way that it resembles that of a viviparous mammal rather than that of a fly. The oft-repeated assertion of the upholders of the theory of permanence, that variation by way of accommodation only produces abnormal forms within the species, is thus seen to be false.

“‘What conclusions are we to draw from these considerations? If we carefully study the phenomena which have just been presented to us, we must acknowledge that only the theory of evolution can explain to us how these interesting forms came into being. We cannot supply a scientific explanation by merely declaring that these strange little creatures—such, for instance, as the Mirmeciton or ant-ape—were created by God expressly for this or that variety of ant. *The principle of the theory of evolution is the only one which supplies us with a natural explanation of these phenomena*, and therefore we accept it. But to what extent are we to accept it? *Just as far as its application is supported by actual proofs.*’

“Surely this is the language of sane science. What a contrast to Weismann’s!

“Moreover, though recognizing the interior causes of evolution as the essential ones, he (Fr. Wasmann) would not totally reject Darwinism. ‘My own experience,’ he says (p. 42), ‘gained in the course of my research work in my special department, shows natural selection to be indispensable as a subsidiary factor, but only a factor—the *interior causes of evolution* remain always the chief points to consider, for they produce the beneficial modifications, and so are of greater importance than external circumstances, for these only eliminate the modifications which are not beneficial in the struggle for existence.’ In view of this acceptance of evolution, Father Wasmann’s conclusions are the most important, and, at the risk of over-quotation, deserve to be given in his own words: ‘But the higher we ascend in the systematic categories and the more closely we approach the great chief types of the animal world, the scantier becomes the evidence; in fact, it fails so completely that we are finally forced to acknowledge that *the assumption of a monophyletic evolution of the whole kingdom of organic life is a delightful dream without any scientific support.*’

"He further endorses Fleischmann's assertion that it is impossible to trace back the chief types of the animal kingdom to one primitive form.

"This, indeed," says Dwight, "is, in my humble opinion, the conclusion to which the great majority of naturalists would subscribe were they driven into a corner and called upon to tell the truth without 'ifs' or 'buts.'"

In discussing the supposed evolution of man Professor Dwight has particularly emphasized the necessity for considering how much is the possibility of degeneration in the human race. Our ordinary ideas of evolution would seem to imply constant progress upwards in rational creatures particularly, but it is well known that such progress does not take place. On the contrary, lofty attainment is often followed by decadence in a nation, and people sink to almost unbelievable levels of degradation. Our statistics of illiteracy in this country, for instance, show that a great many native-born inhabitants whose ancestors have been here for generations must be counted among the illiterates. In the mountain regions of certain parts of the country deterioration to a remarkable degree has taken place. Not only is interest lost in the intellectual life, but moral ideas come into abeyance, and all the better side of man sinks very low. Professor Dwight touches on this (p. 169):

"There is another view of this whole question which deserves respectful consideration, though it is so at variance with the influence of the *Zeitgeist* that little is heard of it. May it not be that many low forms of man, archaic as well as contemporary, are degenerate races? We are told everything, and more than everything, about progress, but decline is put aside. It is impossible to construct a tolerable scheme of ascent among the races of man, but cannot dark points be made light by this theory of degeneration? One of the most obscure, and to me most attractive, of questions is the wiping out of old civilizations. That it has occurred repeatedly and on very extensive scales is as certain as any fact in history. Why is it not reasonable to believe that bodily degeneration took place in those fallen from a higher estate, who, half starved and degraded, returned to savagery? Moreover, the workings of the soul would be hampered by the degenerating brain. For my part, I believe the Neanderthal man to be a specimen of a race not arrested in its upward climb, but thrown down from a higher position. We have been told, I believe by Max Muller, that there are few, if any, of the most degraded races of mankind whose language does not suggest a larger vocabulary than the one now in use. Herbert Spencer speaks in his 'Sociology' of the degradation from something higher of most,

if not of all, the savage tribes of to-day. None the less there is the great objection to this view, the importance of which must not be denied, that the Neanderthal race was an excessively old one, and that skeletons of the higher race, which, according to the view I have offered, must have existed at the same time as the degenerate ones, are still to be discovered."

Such degeneracy as occurs is often not a mere sinking back into animal brutishness, the very form of the phrase that we use apparently supposing our acceptance of an upward progress from the brute, but is a corruption of what is best in us, becoming, in the words of the Roman poet, Publius Syrus, what is worst, *corruptio optimi pessima*. Men actually seem to get into a sort of reactionary state, in which they break all bounds and fairly rejoice in what is worst. The expression that life would scarcely be worth living if the worst that could be had been done, so that there is an ambition to outdo others in ill doing which becomes typical of these decadents. Professor Dwight, in finishing his chapter on "Man," has put this simply and suggestively, without painting a harrowing picture, though there was chance for it, because he wishes not to appeal to the emotions, but to the intellect (p. 178):

"There is another allied aspect of fallen man which must at least be glanced at, dark and repulsive as it is. Let any one consider the refinement of vice in the cruelty, lust and luxury of the Roman Empire and of Oriental despotisms (for very shame's sake we shall look no nearer home), and he will find in it a malice very different from mere savagery. The cause lies deeper than in the survival of animal passions; it is far more suggestive of a fallen angel reveling in evil. It is not the return to a lower state, but the corruption of a higher. Chesterton says truly: 'Man is always something worse or something better than an animal.'"

In the midst of the busy work and study and wide reading that made it possible for Professor Dwight to speak with authority on such subjects, there came the warning that the end was not far off. On July 14, 1910, he wrote to a very dear friend who had been his confessor years before as follows:

"Nahant, July 9, 1910.

"It was a great pleasure to receive your note, and I answer it at once. Both the rumors you heard about me are true in a degree, but the former is the truest. I had had a disquieting attack three years ago, and last summer I had a renewal of it in my bowels. To make it short, early last August they operated on me and found cancer of the intestines. The surgeon did only a temporary operation; that is, he made no attempt to remove the cancer, and made a permanent

opening. I have to wear an apparatus and have an attendant, for all my movements come through this opening. Somehow life is a great deal more tolerable than you would imagine possible. I did a decent amount of work at the Medical School. They have behaved very handsomely to me. I have offered my resignation twice, but they tell me to go on as long as I feel able to do my teaching. Of course, I have had to cut down on scientific work. The cancer is a slow-growing thing, and I look forward to getting through one more winter's work. I eat and sleep fairly well, and have little pain. The discomfort and annoyances are indescribable and disgusting, but somehow God gives me grace to bear them. I want to resign from the St. Vincent de Paul, but the Archbishop will not let me. So much for me. Please pray that I may have the grace of perseverance.

"I really am at a loss to understand why you should make so much of my having gone to see you at the hospital. In view of what you have done for me, I could hardly do less. Please pray for us all; you see there is plenty of need."

A month later he wrote:

"Nahant, August 5, 1910.

"I must write you a line to thank you for your very kind letter, which it was a great pleasure to receive. I want to thank you above all for your great kindness in remembering me in your daily Mass. It is a great blessing for me. I am surprised at the number of people who are praying for me, and I humbly trust that they will obtain for me the grace of final perseverance and of a happy death. Since the operation (within two days of a year ago), when I learned what was the matter, I have never prayed for recovery, but only to die well, and, if it may be, to work a little longer. The doctor was here about a month ago, and spoke of trying serum treatment to *cure* me. I have heard nothing more of it, and imagine he proposes to begin (if I let him) when I am in town. I do not think I should consent if it is likely to break me up and spoil my work. After all, I am nearly sixty-seven. I remember a year or two ago that once after dinner with my medical club they began talking about a man who had died at sixty-eight, and began to find causes for his death. I remarked (and, as I was the youngest, they may not quite have liked it) that when a man died at sixty-eight he had lived his life, and could not complain of being cut off in his prime. Now it is *de me fabula*.

"I trust you yourself are pretty well. Let me thank you once more and beg you not to forget me."

It was while thus bravely, peacefully, calmly facing death, yet

doing his work and gathering up the scattered ends, so that as far as possible his work might be complete, that Professor Dwight finished his book, "The Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist." He had worked at it several times and then put it aside rather modestly, feeling that some one probably might be able to do it better and distrusting his own ability. Now that the end was approaching, he took it up and completed it, leaving it as a legacy of his thought to his generation. Probably no book on evolution has been completed under more solemn circumstances than this. They were literally his last words to his generation, said with consciousness that death was approaching. Statements made under such circumstances are accepted in every court of law in the world as representing absolutely the individual's most conscientious thought, as it were, in the face of God. Such Professor Dwight's book must be taken to be, and the conditions of its writing give a new seriousness to his thoughts and a deeper significance to the conclusions that he reaches. It is written in his modest but kindly way, and while with regard to two men of his generation he uses rather strong expressions, these can readily be seen to be necessitated by the circumstances.

In the preface he said:

"If I be not mistaken, there is more or less curiosity on the part of those outside of the Church to know what Catholics of education, especially those who themselves have worked in science, think in their own hearts of the dogmas of the Church on the one hand and of the assertions of modern science on the other. Are not Catholics guilty of dishonesty in appearing to subscribe to beliefs which they do not sincerely hold, and which fail to accord with what is accepted by the public as science? The suspicion is perhaps not unnatural, especially on the part of those whose ideas of Catholics are distorted by the misrepresentations of centuries. It may be, too, that this suspicion is somewhat strengthened by the very natural unwillingness of men to wear their hearts upon their sleeves, to tell their most secret and solemn thoughts in the market-place.

"It is often said by those outside of the Church that they cannot see how a Catholic can be a man of science, and, conversely, how a man of science can be a Catholic. Indeed, I fear there are many poorly instructed Catholics who are very much of the same opinion. It may be that it is my duty, on account of the position I have the honor to hold, to give to both of these classes such poor help as I can. It is many years since I began this book, which I have thrown aside again and again. Apart from the difficulty of finding time for the work, it seemed impossible to do it to my own satisfaction and to say anything which has not been better said. While I fear that

the last objection still holds good, yet I hope that this little book may fall into hands which have not held the better ones. It is just possible that some of those who have been my pupils during the twenty-seven years of my professorship may be interested in the views as mine. Should that be the case, I am sure that I need not tell them that this discussion is meant, above all, to be an honest one.

"The book bears the imprimatur of the Church. The nature of some of the topics discussed made it my bounden duty to apply for it, but I should have done so in any case, that there might be no question as to the orthodoxy of any of my statements."

Those who would know the details of Professor Dwight's attitude toward faith and science must follow him in that book, though I have given in the course of this article a number of quotations that will serve to show the drift of his thinking. One or two other phases of his thought which illustrate his position on such important problems as vitalism—the existence of a principle of life apart from the ordinary forces of matter—and with regard to regeneration, the study of which has told more against natural selection as an important factor in evolution than any other recent studies, deserve to be further dwelt on.

The most important phase of biological knowledge in recent times has been the study of regeneration or repair in living tissues. The more careful studies are made on this subject the less room is left for any thought of animals as mere machines, or as collections of cells more or less independent of each other, and the more clear does it become that there is a coördination of all the portions of the organism for the benefit of the whole and an orderly directing of the various cells to all the purposes that maintain the life and preserve the integrity of the being to which they belong. For this Professor Dwight has quoted from Driesch's Gifford lectures a passage which shows how strongly arguments drawn from this source have influenced modern biology. Driesch, who is the professor of biology at Heidelberg, a student of Haeckel's in his early career, has come to see the utter absurdity of mere materialism in biology and of the assertion that living bodies are machines. Driesch says:

"Now, you may ask yourselves if you could imagine any sort of a machine, which consists of many parts, but not even of an absolutely fixed number, all of which are equal in their faculties, but all of which in each single case, in spite of their potential equality, not only produce together a certain totality, but also arrange themselves typically *in order* to produce this totality. We *are* indeed familiar with certain occurrences in nature where such curious facts are observed, but I doubt if you would speak of them as 'machines' in

these cases. The mesenchyma cells, in fact, behave just as a number of workmen would do who are to construct, say, a bridge. All of them *can* do every single act, all of them *can* assume every single position; the result always is to be a perfect bridge, even if some of the workmen become sick or are killed by an accident. The 'prospective values' of a single workman change in such a case."

On this Professor Dwight has a comment that adds much to the force of the argument, and his carrying out of the figure of the bridge shows how strong is the present biological position in favor of vitalism—that is, of an independent principle of life that governs and rules the whole organism for the benefit of the whole, using the various powers and capacities of the portions of the organism not merely for themselves, but also for the benefit of the being to which they all belong:

"That is to say, that if certain cells are injured, their places can be taken by others quasi-intelligently and doing other than the work which would naturally have fallen to them. But Driesch might have gone further and have supposed that some accident had happened to the bridge in the course of construction, and have told us that then these same cells would have rearranged themselves and have made, if not the contemplated bridge, at least a very tolerable substitute for one. Instances might easily be cited of the behavior of the bony tissue after a fracture, say, of the neck of the femur, in which the architectural design is repaired with adaptation to the new conditions. Surely this is more than the work of a machine, but, what is at this moment more to the point, it is more than the work of a very large number of cells. Even if we yield ourselves to the absurdity of calling the cells intelligent, we must admit that this is not enough. Let us suppose such an accident happening to an actual bridge with an army of workmen upon and about it. How in the world will they start without consultation to repair it? Who will decide what is the proper plan to adopt? Who will tell each man what to do? It takes little imagination to see that without a leader the result will be fatal and hopeless confusion. If a leading spirit would be necessary for men, how much more so for cells? Now, this guiding power cannot be material, for it pervades the whole. This it is that presides over development, growth, repair. In the mineral kingdom we find one set of phenomena which resembles these shown in the process of repair in the living. It is manifested in crystals in process of formation which, when injured, are not only repaired, but repaired in more than one way, according to circumstances. The analogy with vital processes is very striking, but, after all, it applies to but one of the manifestations of life."

Sometimes the extent to which the directing power of the principle of life will go for the benefit of the organism is very striking. In processes of repair, when the original tissues cannot be replaced, and when even the original functions cannot be exercised, sometimes other functions are made to replace them so as to benefit the organism as far as possible. The case that is cited by Professor Dwight is particularly striking in this regard, and amply justifies his emphatic conclusion (p. 133):

"Some experiments by Herbst have shown a wonderful provision (so to speak) for the good of the whole by the adoption on the part of the organism of different methods of repair according to the injury. Thus, if both the eye and the optic ganglion be removed from the crayfish, no new eye appears; but if the ganglion be left, an eye is reproduced. This is certainly sufficiently wonderful, but it is far short of the whole truth. If both the eye and the ganglion be removed, an antenna arises in their place. In short, it being impossible to restore sight, an organ of touch makes what amends it can for the want of the eye. It seems to me that this observation alone is fatal to any materialistic conception of the living organism."

In *THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY* for July, 1892, Professor Dwight had an article on "Matter and Form in Biology," in which he brought out the fact that the old scholastic way of looking at living things and considering that they had a principle of life called a form in mediæval philosophy was a helpful point of view even for the modern time. In that article he discusses various anomalies and variations, as well as monstrosities among human beings in their relation to the principle of life. At that time, twenty years ago, the mechanists—that is, the observers in biology who explained all the manifestations of life on mechanical principles—were very prominent. Macallister, the British anatomist; Professor Cope, the American zoölogist, and Professor Wilhelm Roux, the German embryologist, were the most prominent. Professor Dwight has discussed the principle taken by each living thing and pointed out that there is always something more than environment and mechanical factors to be considered. Among other phases of the subject, he discusses the specimen of the left arm bearing seven fingers which was in the museum of the Harvard Medical School. Matter alone, without a directing form, could not have developed in this way, though this is only a striking exemplification, and the formation of the normal limb can only be explained in the same way. Professor Dwight says (p. 462):

"Other and, perhaps, more puzzling cases might be mentioned. Nothing is further from our thought than to imply that the system

of matter and form makes clear even the simplest of the problems we have before us. The point we wish to emphasize is that, though not clear to our imagination, this system is satisfactory to reason. There is no conflict between it and the observation of physical science. It shows that life is the result of an immanent force. External forces (counting as such the physical properties even of internal parts of the organism) can and do modify, but cannot originate. That the mode of action of the form is beyond us is not a defect of the system, but the consequence of our limited powers. After all, what process of physical forces, even in non-living bodies, can we claim to truly know and understand?"

A typical example of Professor Dwight's use of his knowledge of the whole round of medical sciences, in order to illustrate the necessity for accepting the existence of a principle of life, may be found, as it seems to me, in the following paragraphs from his last book. As he has said himself, he has tried to put it in language that would be easily understood by those who are not anatomists, and I think any one who reads it will confess that he has succeeded admirably in doing so (p. 141) :

"The following instance, also from human anatomy, is a more striking one. I shall try to make it intelligible to those who are not anatomists. The pneumogastric is a great nerve extending from the base of the skull through the neck down into the thorax, in the upper part of which the right one passes in front of the subclavian artery, which is an important vessel arching over the lung near its apex and passing out under the collar-bone to supply the right arm with blood. As the nerve passes this artery it gives off a branch, the recurrent laryngeal nerve (so called from its course), which, hooking under the vessel, passes backwards and then upwards to the larynx, the organ of voice, in which it supplies most of the muscles of the right side. Now, it seems surprising that as the pneumogastric passed directly beside the larynx in its descent the branch is not given off at the level of the larynx, instead of having to take this retrograde course. The answer is that in the early stages of the embryo the heart is situated very much higher than later (in fact, it is very near to the head), and that the nerve, in fact, passed to the larynx below the arterial arch, which later forms the right subclavian. As the heart descends to its permanent place the arches descend with it, and the nerve is drawn down by the arch, so that to reach its destination it has to travel upward. This is the usual explanation, and there is no doubt that it is the true one, for in certain cases in which the right subclavian artery develops in an abnormal manner, so that the arch is not formed across the laryngeal nerve, the latter passes directly by the shortest way from its parent

trunk to the larynx. This seems conclusively that normally the nerve is pulled down. But note what happens in the adult when a swelling of the subclavian artery (aneurism) presses on the recurrent nerve as it passes under it. The nerve is disorganized by the pressure, so that paralysis of the muscles supplied by it is the result. Now, the displacement of the nerve by this swelling is insignificant compared to that resulting from the change of position during development. Moreover, in the adult the nerve is protected by fibrous tissue, while in the early embryo it is little more than a chain of cells, yet they resist the strain. This pulling down of the nerve is confirmed by the fact that it takes another course when there is no strain upon it, while under usual circumstances it allows itself to be dragged. The only explanation conceivable is that the delicate cells of the developing nerve yield, as it were, willingly to the pull of the artery, while in the adult they perish under the pressure of an abnormal swelling."

Probably Dr. Dwight's most striking points in this book are made in the chapter on "Living and Non-Living," in which he has placed under contribution not only the writings of others, but his own extensive observation on anatomy. He had specially emphasized the power of the living organism to repair itself and the capacity manifested to make these repairs in such a way as will at once best overcome the injury, yet, as a rule, preserve the function of the part. Occasionally it is impossible for the organic structures to be put in their former condition, and then the repairs are made in such a way as will be most conducive to the restoration of function. As Dr. Dwight puts it:

"Yet what is most extraordinary is that efforts are made by the organism to carry on an interrupted function by appropriate changes in the apparatus. Let the artery of a limb be tied so that the supply of blood is cut off; the branches above and below the ligature enlarge so that what is called the collateral circulation is established. Some one may say that of course they enlarge by the increased pressure of the blood behind them, due to the cutting off of the direct supply, but what is noteworthy is that the arterial branches below the interruption enlarge also, so that there is an obvious effort to reestablish the circulation of the limb. Instead of this occurring, one would think it more simple for the arterial blood to go back to the heart as quickly as possible by the enlargement of the capillaries and veins above the injury, thus leaving the limb to its fate. But that is not what happens; there is something providing for the welfare of the whole."

Professor Dwight's familiarity with the general literature of the biological sciences enables him often to quote striking passages, and

the accumulation of a number of these makes his book very effective. Probably none of his quotations is more apt than that with which he closes his chapter on "Design and Plan." I prefer, for obvious reasons, to give his own introduction to the quotation and concluding comment (p. 115):

"I have been deeply impressed by some remarks of the late Marquis of Salisbury at the Oxford meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1894. They cannot have been pleasing to many of those who heard them, but yet, so far as I know, they have never been answered. In fact, it was one of those attacks which can only be ignored; silence was the only resource of his adversaries. 'Professor Mendelyev,' he said, 'has shown that the perplexing list of elements can be divided into families of about seven, speaking very roughly; that all these families resemble each other in this, that as to weight, volume, heat and laws of combination the members of each family are ranked among themselves in obedience to the same rule. Each family differs from the others, but each is internally constructed upon the same plan.'

"'What was weakness in this theory was turned into strength,' to quote again his words, 'by the discovery of certain elements which were wanting in some of the groups when the law was first announced. The discovery of these coördinate families dimly points to some identical origin, without suggesting the nature of their genesis or the nature of their common parentage. If they were organic beings, all our difficulties would be solved by muttering the comfortable word "evolution"—one of those indefinite words, from time to time vouchsafed to humanity, which has the gift of alleviating so many perplexities and masking so many gaps in our knowledge. But the families of elementary atoms do not breed, and we cannot therefore ascribe their ordered difference to accidental variations perpetuated by heredity under the influence of natural selection.'

"Thus we see curious arrangements in inorganic nature distinctly proclaiming law and order, which cannot be explained away by the slang which in biology is allowed to pass for argument. If, then, there be law and order in the lifeless which can be accounted for only by assuming an intelligent Creator (for the doctrine of blundering chance is really beneath contempt), why, in the name of reason, are they to be excluded from the realm of the living?"

With Professor Dwight's interest in biological science thus illustrated, his faith becomes of special interest because of the impression which prevails so commonly that a profound knowledge of science, and especially of modern science, is almost incompatible with deep, firm faith. It matters not how often the opposite of this is illus-

trated in the lives of distinguished Catholic scientists, the impression still continues. It is easy to understand why, without at all wishing to either be controversial or to say what might seem harsh, that faith in Protestantism should be dissolved by modern science. It has often been pointed out that there is no complete and logical system of faith in the Protestant Churches. They all have breaks in the succession of their truths as in their connection with the early Church. It is comparatively easy, however, for the Catholic scientist to retain his faith and his membership in the Church. He does this not by ignoring the teachings of the Church or minimizing their significance, but, on the contrary, the more he knows about his faith and the more he employs exactly the same powers of intellect on it that gave him his capacity for original investigation in science, the firmer is it likely to be. Pasteur expressed this on a famous occasion to an old clergyman when he declared that he could not understand how people declared that science disturbed their faith.

The editor of the *Boston Transcript*, September 9, 1911, after speaking of Dr. Dwight's high moral courage, his perfectly frank and fearless expression of opinion and the genuine worth and ability, the keen perception of which had led to his election as professor of anatomy, said of him: "And here we are brought inevitably face to face with another no less important nor significant aspect of Dwight's intrinsicity as a man—his ardent and ever-militant Catholicism. Without taking this into account no consideration of him would be complete. It, as it were, explains all the rest of him. Although not actually born within the Roman Catholic communion, he may none the less truly be said to have been a predestined Catholic. His Catholic faith was a direct, unmistakable expression of his whole inner nature, of his irrepressible, innate bent for the recognition of, obedience to and legitimate exercise of authority. He was a born authoritarian, if the word may be coined. Deeply religious by nature, he could have satisfied his own peculiar religious constitution in no other way. Practical manifestation of his deep religiousness was evident in many ways, but one may be pardoned for mentioning the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the Roman Catholic organization for the relief and care of the poor, of which we was president and in which he spent himself generously, with immense results, to this noble cause."

In 1883 Professor Dwight, just after his acceptance of the professorship at Harvard, married Miss Sara Catherine Iasigi, a descendant of a Greek family that had lived in Boston for several generations and was devoutly Catholic. This union served to strengthen Dr. Dwight's own Catholicity, and their household became a model of Christian happiness. Dr. Dwight soon realized

that his Catholicity must show itself not only in attendance to Church duties, but also in that personal service to those in need that must be the expression of a truly Christian spirit. Accordingly he associated himself with the Conference of St. Vincent de Paul in Boston, and soon became a leading spirit, and eventually for many years its president.

For those who may not know the story of the foundation of the Conference of St. Vincent de Paul a word may be said to show how suitable this work was to Professor Dwight's position, and what an opportunity it gave him for the exercise of his influence. Frederick Ozanam, a brilliant young teacher of literature and philosophy at the University of Paris in the early part of the nineteenth century, was impatient, above all, with the expressions that he heard around him in the university life of the time that Christianity was an outworn creed, whose formulas could not help in the solution of modern social problems. When he protested against such expressions a number of his colleagues and many of those around him in the life of the university quarter asked him to show them where the Church was employed in doing its service of care for the poor and the ailing, for the unfortunate and the needy, and how it was helping in the uplift of the masses of humanity.

Owing to the disturbances occasioned by the French Revolution, the confiscation of Church property, the execution of many priests and Bishops, the scattering of the hierarchy and the difficulties of subsequent reorganization, the Church in Paris at this time was not, it must be frankly confessed, making itself felt in the life of the people to such a degree that an ardent Catholic like Ozanam could be proud of it. Indeed, its accomplishment in social service was a poignant disappointment. Instead of finding fault with ecclesiastical authorities so hampered by conditions that they could not act successfully in the matter as yet, Ozanam proceeded to supply for the defect he saw in the very simple way of organizing a bureau of personal service to be taken up by Catholic laymen, their work to be accomplished under the direction of ecclesiastical superiors. This was the origin of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, as they were called. Their proclaimed purpose was to become personally acquainted with the poor, to know their wants at first hand, to help them when they absolutely needed it by alms, but above all to help them to help themselves. They endeavored to keep families together, to keep the boys from bad company, the girls from evil influences, to find work for those who were without it, to help widowed mothers in the care of their children, to see that education should be provided for them, and in general to prove the friend in need—that is, a friend in deed. These Conferences of St.

Vincent de Paul now exist all over the world, and have been particularly successful in America. It is easy to understand what an opportunity for the expression of Christian zeal and charity they afforded to Professor Dwight.

Perhaps the best idea of Professor Dwight's simple faith will be gathered from the following paragraphs, which occur in the preamble of the resolutions of condolence passed by the St. Vincent de Paul Society just after his death. The resolutions are so different from what is ordinarily supposed to be the attitude of men of our time towards the things of faith as to be noteworthy. Usually such expressions are thought of as almost mediæval. Simple faith and humble, earnest purpose, however, are still as characteristic of Catholic men when on Christian service bent as they ever were. The society said:

"Professor Dwight was president of the Holy Cross Conference when the former president of the Council, Thomas F. Ring, died, and the presidency became vacant. After several meetings and prayerful deliberations, Dr. Dwight was requested to allow his name to be proposed to fill the vacancy.

"When first approached by the committee he hesitated to give a decided answer, and asked for time to think the matter over. He said that he feared that his numerous professional engagements would prevent him from performing the duties of the office, and also that he had a strong doubt of being able to come up to the high standard established by Mr. Ring.

"After a week's deliberation and consulting with several of his particular friends, he informed the committee that he considered the call as coming from a higher Power, and consented to allow his name to go to the Council to be voted on. At the next meeting he was unanimously elected.

"How fittingly Professor Dwight filled the position and how faithfully and satisfactorily he performed its duties is well known to every member of the society.

"He gave his valuable time and mature judgment to the work, sacrificing many hours in attending the meetings, consulting with his officers and in visiting conferences. His name and influence have tended greatly in bringing the practical charitable work of the society to the notice of the public and placing the society on a higher plane in the community than ever before.

"Dr. Dwight's intercourse with the members of the society has been of the most brotherly nature. His universal courtesy and innate gentlemanly character endeared him to all. His name and deeds will long be remembered and be bright examples to every member of the society."

Professor Dwight was not of those who, however, believe that the whole of man's religious duty consists in service to humanity. He had no share at all in that very interesting illusion that has, during the past few generations, come over those outside of the Church who are still professing Christians. When Protestantism broke away from Catholicity the great rule of religion was to be "faith, but not works." The Gospel of James, which proclaimed the value of good works, was, in Luther's words, a gospel of straw. If a man only believed firmly, it mattered little what he did. A transformation has come, however, and now those who somehow still continue to look up to Luther as a great reformer have changed their ground and insist that it really matters not what a man believes, but what he does for others. Religion has changed from faith in divinity to charity towards man. What was a divine religion has changed to the religion of humanity. The old Church teaching was in Luther's time and still is: believe firmly and manifest your faith by good works. Good works alone without other manifestations of a faith are not sufficient, however. Besides service to humanity, Professor Dwight was convinced of the necessity of service to the Divinity directly, as far as that is possible in this imperfect state. Prayer was for him, however, a great, living act of worship and adoration, and as important for the life of the soul as service for one's neighbor. While chronicling his interest in the work of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, we must not forget that he was the founder in Boston of the devotion of the Holy Hour, in which men spend once a month an hour before the Blessed Sacrament in prayer and meditation. It may seem strange to some to think of a professor of anatomy in the modern time going from his dissecting room to his Holy Hour of devotion before the Blessed Sacrament, but that strangeness is only due to certain quite recent developments in a population that is losing its faith. Of many a scientist of the olden time of Ozanam, of Ampère, of Galvani, of Laennec, of Pasteur, of Theodor Schwann, of Johann Müller, of O'Dwyer, of Volta, to say nothing of the great mediæval scientists, Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, whose sanctity has been proclaimed by the Church, the practice of even prolonged prayer is a well confirmed historical tradition. Professor Dwight was only following the footsteps of great Catholic exemplars in his fostering for himself and others of a habit of prayer.

One who was very close to Professor Dwight and his family, writing of him in *America*, September 30, 1911, said:

"The world knew Thomas Dwight as the distinguished scientist and teacher. Boston also had a reason to be proud of him as a faithful public servant. These services alone would make more

than an ordinary creditable record for one human life. Yet there is another phase of his character—his life as a Catholic.

"It is interesting to note that in connection with Pasteur's words as to his own firm faith that Dr. Dwight stated to his son, less than two years ago, that he had never suffered any temptations against faith. There is no reason to think that there is any other record for these last months of his life. His faith had the simplicity and straightforwardness of that of a child, and as a most loyal son of the Church he never swerved in his hearty submission to her decrees. If the Church spoke, that sufficed for him. It was no commonplace Catholic life that could ever have satisfied that loyal Catholic soul, and he lived what he professed. The same signal ability, the same earnestness of purpose, the same enthusiasm shown in so many other ways had in his Catholic work that ineffable something more added which only the supernatural motive could give. He most truly sanctified his talents in his work for the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, of which he was for many years a prominent and devoted member, and at the time of his death still held the position of president of the General Council. His work for the society was wholly in the spirit of the founder, holding the conviction that the good done to the soul of the man privileged to be a worker was far greater than that of the recipient of charity."

There are some extremely interesting traditions with regard to Professor Dwight and his dissecting room work. The bodies that come to dissecting rooms in America are those of the very poor who have died in some public institution and have absolutely no friends to care for them. It is about as tragic an ending of life as one can well imagine, for there surely have been times in life when most of the owners of these bodies, one might well say all of them, have had high hopes and have not thought at all of the possibility of death amidst neglect and friendlessness. Professor Dwight felt a certain responsibility toward the former owners of the bodies whose abandoned property he was now using to such good advantage. Accordingly he made it a rule that he should have Masses said for the souls of the bodies that came to the dissecting room. It was a precious religious idea, but it is an extremely taking humanitarian thought that for these poor, abandoned creatures, of whom the English poet said: "Rattle his bones over the stones, is only a pauper whom nobody owns." Some one should have had the fine feeling to think of their future in this very practical way. The advance of science in modern time is supposed to take the educated away from the fine, old-fashioned customs—or superannuated superstitions, as some do not hesitate to call them—with regard to prayers for the dead, and, above all, with regard to the offering of Masses for souls.

Sneers at such Church money-making arrangements are not uncommon. Far from any such thoughts, this great anatomist—not for his friends, but for the forgotten, neglected ones whom others had no thought for, and who had died friendless or their bodies would not come to him—thought it worth while to make offerings every year as a satisfying act of charity.

And yet this simple faith should not surprise any one who knows the biographic history even of our modern science, for it cannot be too often repeated that our greatest nineteenth century scientists have not been unbelievers, but, on the contrary, have nearly always been even devout upholders, if not of some definite religion, at least of the fact that science itself, as Lord Kelvin declares, teaches us the existence of a Creator, and that the contemplation of the material world around us, even apart from living things, as Clerk Maxwell frequently proclaimed, shows us the existence not only of a Creator, but of great laws of the universe which indicate His providential care of the world. There may be, indeed there must be, mysteries in the relation of the infinite to the finite. If God were entirely comprehensible to man, man would be greater than God. We actually rise above even the immensity of the universe by being able to understand it thoroughly so far as we know it. It must be different to the moral order, but the existence of mysteries is only an argument for, and not at all against, the existence of God.

While it is sometimes said, in the words of an old maxim, that where there are three physicians, there are two atheists, we do not find this exemplified when the roll of great original investigators in medical sciences in the nineteenth century is called. The great father of modern German medicine, Johann Müller, the teacher of that great group of medical biologists among whom were Virchow, and Schwann, and Du Bois-Reymond, and Brücke and Clapperade and Remak, was a devout Catholic; so was his great pupil, Theodor Schwann, to whom we owe the discovery of cells and the foundation of modern biology. So was Laennec, the father of modern physical diagnosis, the greatest clinical student of medicine during the nineteenth century; so also was Corrigan, to whom we owe so much of our knowledge with regard to heart conditions. But these are not all: Claude Bernard, the great French physiologist, during the last five years of his life returned to the devout practice of his religion as a Catholic. Pasteur, the greatest medical scientist of the nineteenth century, lies buried in a little chapel under the main door of the Pasteur Institute, where, by his request, Mass is said regularly for his soul; and all his life he had been not only a devout Catholic, but a great scientist who could not understand how science was supposed in any way to disturb faith. The more he knew, he said,

the deeper was his faith. "If I had all the knowledge I would like to have, I would have the faith of a Breton peasant. If I knew all there was to be known, I should have the faith of a Breton peasant woman." That is usually supposed to be the limit in faith, and is about the equivalent of an Irish peasant woman's belief, the two being of the same Celtic race.

What is thus true in the medical sciences, where, according to tradition, we might expect to find just the contrary, is exemplified in any science the lives of whose great contributors are well known. Of the men after whom units of electricity are named, because the International Electrical Congress thought they deserved that honor for their discoveries in electrical science, nearly every one is a Catholic. Galvani died asking to be buried in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis; Volta's favorite devotion was the rosary. Coulomb belonged to the Church, and so did Ohm. Ampère was like Pasteur, only probably with even more of piety in his make-up, and the traditions show him to us as particularly devout in his devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Among Protestants, such men as Faraday, Lord Kelvin, Clerk Maxwell and Oersted are on record with strong expressions of the deepest belief in religious principles, and with the firmest grasp on the ideas that underlie the relations of God to man and of man to his fellows in our human responsibility.

On the other hand, it is rather interesting to realize what is thought of the scientific standing of some of the scientists who have been most ardent in their declarations of the absolute incompatibility of science and faith. Professor Haeckel, for instance, while acknowledged as a scientific authority with regard to certain lower forms of life, owes his popular reputation and the immense vogue of his books to his writings with regard to the moral aspects of the world and the denial of any possible religion for a man of science. Professor Dwight, then, has shown how thoroughly discredited Haeckel is by his fellow-scientists in Germany in order to contrast in his chapter on "Thought of the Day" with that scientific opinion the popular estimation of Haeckel. If Haeckel were right in his contentions, then there could be no reconciliation of faith and science. But Haeckel's science has been impugned by fellow-scientists whose reputations are greater even than his own, and they have pointed out that he hesitates at no subterfuge to prove his point and scruples at no petty deceit in order to obtain a basis for his contentions. Because of the contrast between Dwight himself and Haeckel—their years run nearly contemporary—it seems worth while to quote Professor Dwight at some length (p. 21):

"I should be glad to pass this man by without more words, but

for the very reason that he is looked upon as a leader and a prophet—not by the ignorant alone, but by many who should know better—for their enlightenment it is necessary to show what his word is worth. This was done as long ago as 1874 by the late Professor Wilhelm His, the great embryologist, and one of the most respected leaders of science.

“In a book entitled ‘Unser Körperform und das physiologische Problem ihrer Entstehung’ His shows how Haeckel in the first edition of his ‘*Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*,’ wishing to show the likeness of embryos of different species, gives on page 242 figures of the egg, one hundred times magnified, of man, the ape and the dog; and on page 248 also three figures of the embryo of the dog, of the chick and of the turtle. His points out quite amusingly certain features of resemblance in the three figures of these two series. Not only are these figures identical in outline, but in non-essentials also. Thus it happens that the granules in a certain part of the dog’s egg are coarser than in the other parts, and there is an absolutely identical arrangement in the eggs of man and of the ape. Very remarkably, the first vertebra in the embryos of the dog, chick and turtle is a little more rounded on the right side, and the ninth a trifle narrower than the others. In short, to make the pretended similarity as striking as possible Haeckel used in two instances the same figure and gave it three different names. This fraud was pointed out by Professor Rutimeyer in ‘*Archiv für Anthropologie*,’ Bd. III., s. 301. Professor His remarks that one would expect a retraction and excuse for the mistake; but no. ‘Instead of this, Haeckel, in the preface of his later editions, heaped heavy insults on Professor Rutimeyer, equally untrue in their substance as dishonorable in their form. He, however, saw fit to omit the duplicates. But the exposure did him no good. Professor His tells us that in the fifth edition of the same work of Haeckel’s there is a copy from Bischoff of the figures of an embryo of a dog, and from Ecker of one of a human embryo, both assumed to be of four weeks. He points out certain peculiarities of these ‘copies’ well worthy of notice. ‘For,’ he asks, ‘is it through a mistake of the lithographer that in Haeckel’s dog embryo precisely the frontal part of the head is three and one-half millimetres longer than in Bischoff’s, but in the human embryo the forehead is shortened by two millimetres, and at the same time, by the pushing forward of the eye, made narrower by fully five millimetres?’ In short, what purported to be copies of figures published by leading authorities and respectable men were falsifications made to show a similarity which does not exist between the embryos of man and dog. His then points out false dealings by Haeckel in the matter of illustrations, some of which he declares to

have been invented (erfunden), and remarks very justly that his play with facts is far more dangerous than his play with words, inasmuch as it requires an expert to denounce it. He charges that Haeckel well knew the influence that he exercised on a large circle. 'Let, then, others honor Haeckel as an efficient and reckless party leader; according to my judgment he has forfeited through his methods of fighting even the right to be counted as an equal in the company of serious investigators' (p. 171). There is only to add that Haeckel, in spite of plenty of subsequent exposures, has not reformed his ways."

Not alone as men live must we judge them, but as they die, "for it is fated to all men once to die." Professor Dwight's utter peacefulness, yet thoroughgoing devotion to his daily work while death hung over him, attracted the attention of many of his colleagues, who knew what the near future held in store for him. They could not but admire him, and, as he himself attributed his state of mind to his faith, they could not help but think much of a faith that thus proved helpful under the stress of the greatest emergency of life. His biographer in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* said: "To Dr. Dwight himself, and especially to all who had the privilege of working with him in his department, it was a source of great gratification to see how much he accomplished in the last two years when he was under the sentence of death. The excellence of his instruction and of his last contributions to anatomical science showed that he was fully justified in continuing his work to the end and practically dying in harness. To accomplish all this under such peculiarly trying conditions showed the extent of his cheerfulness and courage. Though most of the time suffering much discomfort, and often actual pain, he never complained, and seemed actually to do all he could to make everything go smoothly. His strong religious faith was of great help and encouragement to him at this time, and aided him greatly to accomplish what he did. His own courage and resolution to show no signs of weakness were beyond all praise, and the results attained under a handicap which must have been greater than one can easily realize must be due to those qualities. His was a splendid example of what can be done under the most trying conditions at a time when it seemed as if it were impossible to continue, and was a fitting end to an unselfish, laborious and notable career."

Every one who knew him was struck by the calmness with which he faced death. Malignant disease, especially when it affects an internal organ, is, in spite of all our vaunted advance in medicine, likely to be fatal if it once gains a good foothold. In Dr. Dwight's case it was very early manifest that the termination of his disease

would be inevitably fatal. Only a physician is sure to be able to realize the absolute truth of such a prognosis. The non-medical patient is likely to have some hope until the fatal issue is rather close. Two years before his death Dr. Dwight knew that death was upon him, and that it was only a question of a comparatively short time before his disease would take him away. He faced that certain prospect not with stoicism, but with Christian fortitude. Certain things he wanted to leave completed, so he calmly set about them in spite of pain and discomfort and whatever of solicitude there might be as to the painful termination of his disease. His book, "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," which had been taken up and put aside a number of times, was now a task to be completed. He finished it, sent it to the printer and had the satisfaction of knowing from the preliminary reviews of it that he was leaving to his generation a precious legacy of philosophic and scientific thought on subjects where faith and science touch, and on which his lifelong studies had given him the right to opinions.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City.

REGINALD POLE, PRINCE OF THE CHURCH.¹

IT IS impossible to write in terms of too high praise of the manner in which the author of the interesting volume before us has discharged the task he undertook when he set himself to prepare a biography of one of the most fascinating and remarkable of the many fascinating and remarkable characters who crowd the stage of English history. Mr. Haile does not exaggerate in even the least degree when he says, at the very opening of the handsome volume before us, that: "Few figures stand out from among the shadows of the past more clearly or with a friendlier aspect than does that of Reginald Pole—learned, simple-minded, pious, endowed with intellectual gifts of the highest order, wise and prudent in counsel, ardently zealous and yet patient and long-suffering in the extreme, and with a rectitude of mind as true to its conscience as the needle to the pole. Of a jocund humor, which many waters could not quench, and delightful in conversation, he was endeared to his contemporaries by qualities that have left a memory and a fragrance which time does not stale, but carries on from age to age." Even his most

¹ "Life of Reginald Pole," by Martin Haile, second edition. London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1911.

prejudiced enemies, and he had many, were compelled to acknowledge his abilities, his virtues and the splendid spirituality of his life. The man's personal charm, produced by his great grace of manner, intense holiness of life and complete mastery of all the learning of the time, secured the admiration and affection of all with whom he came in contact. It would have been strange if Reginald Pole had been other than he was, seeing the stock from which he sprung. "After the Battle of Bosworth, the fortune of the field, the axe and the assassin had reduced the immediate representatives of the House of York to three in number, frail shoots of the once flourishing White Rose: Edward, the little Earl of Warwick and Salisbury, only son of the beheaded Clarence, and though only ten years old, already held in durance for the past two years by Richard III. in Sheriff Hutton Castle; the child's elder sister, Margaret Plantagenet, and his cousin Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Edward IV.² Henry VII. secured the latter princess by marrying her himself; he hastened to remove the Earl of Warwick from Sheriff Hutton Castle to the more rigorous confinement of the Tower, and looking about for a safe bestowal for the Lady Margaret, gave her in marriage to a kinsman of his own, and one of his closest adherents, Sir Richard Pole, a Knight of the Garter, son of Sir Geoffrey Pole, who had married Edith St. John, half-sister to Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII.'s mother."³ Reginald Pole was the third son of the union between Sir Richard Pole and Margaret Plantagenet. The marriage resulted in the birth of four sons and two daughters.

On the 28th of November, 1499—three months before the birth of the future Cardinal—Henry VII., acting, it is said, under Spanish influence, had the unfortunate young Earl of Warwick, Lady Pole's brother, executed on Tower Hill. The reason generally assigned for this cruel and monstrous deed is that King Ferdinand of Spain refused to permit the betrothal of his daughter, Katherine of Aragon, to Henry's eldest son, Arthur, Prince of Wales, so long as Warwick, whose legitimate claim to the throne was incontrovertible, lived. The dispatches of the Spanish Ambassador still exist to show how persistent were his efforts to secure the execution of the Earl, who was only twenty-four years of age and had been in captivity for sixteen years. Every one knows what followed—how Katherine of Aragon was nominally married to Prince Arthur—then thirteen years of age—how her boy husband, in name

² Mr. Halle says: "Edmund de la Pole, chief of the Yorkist party, was an outlawed, wandering exile in France, and the claims of Edward IV.'s younger daughters were of little account during the lifetime of Elizabeth and her descendants." "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 2.

³ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 3.

only, died within two years, and how the Princess—in order to maintain the Spanish alliance—was promptly betrothed to the future Henry VIII., thus laying the foundation of all the false pretenses which eventually led to the breach with the Holy See and the Protestantizing of England. It was on the 3d of March, 1500, that Reginald Pole was born, at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire. His father, Sir Richard, was not only a wealthy land owner, but also the holder of many high offices of a civil and semi-military nature. Mr. Haile remarks that, consequently: "For the first five years of his life Reginald Pole lived in the bustling activity and commotion of his father's house, we had almost said his father's court, so numerous and so varied were the individuals who went to make up the retinue, or, as it was called, the 'family' of an important personage of that period—from the chaplain, pages, ladies-in-waiting, squires, minstrels, perhaps a dwarf or a jester, and the numerous servants, who still live for us in Shakespeare's plays; with the crowd of retainers without, both horse and foot, bill and bowmen, armorers, falconers and many more down to the swineherds and hewers of wood and drawers of water—to each and all of whom the master's will was law, and every well-appointed castle had its dungeon for the unruly. Both within and without there was a mixture of magnificence and ceremonial, with a great simplicity of custom—sharp distinctions and yet closer bonds of union and mutual reliance between the lord and his men and the lady and her women. In Margaret Plantagenet the King had bestowed upon Sir Richard Pole a wife such as Solomon described as the prudent woman, whose household is clothed in scarlet and whose price is far above rubies."⁴ Lady Pole had, at any early date after the arrival in England of Katherine of Aragon, secured the confidence, affection and sympathy of that Princess, who fully recognized and proportionately deeply deplored the cruelty of the execution of the Earl of Warwick. Moreover, the death of Sir Richard Pole in 1505 made his widow still more an object of commiseration to the future Queen. On the 22d of April, 1509, King Henry VII. died, and although, for some occult reason of his own, he had compelled his son to sign a protest against his intended marriage to Katherine, there is no reason to suppose that the boy had any genuine objection of his own to the proposed arrangement. Indeed, if he had, it is doubtful if he would have dared to express it, for it is on record that the King, when he deemed it necessary, did not hesitate to subject his heir to tremendous personal chastisement. This, of course, was only in accordance with the universal practice of the time, children being treated with a

⁴ "Life of Reginald Pole," pp. 5, 6.

severity which would seem appalling to modern parents. The probability is that the purpose Henry VII. had in mind was to keep the document in reserve for use if Ferdinand played him false and it should seem politic not to allow the marriage contract to be fulfilled. The best evidence that the Prince was not a willing author of the protest is that within two months of his father's death, being then Henry VIII., he insisted on carrying out his engagement and on his marriage to Katherine being solemnized. He was then eighteen years of age, while she was nearly twenty-five. The act was a perfectly voluntary one, and Mr. Haile remarks that "all accounts agree as to the happiness of the union, when the music-loving, lusty Prince, as fond of his studies—theological and other—as he was of sport and games, was the delight of all beholders, full of good impulses and ready to further the good of his people. He was as ready as his wife to undo, as far as it was possible, the injury his father had done to Margaret Pole; and one of the first acts of his reign was to bestow on her an annuity of £100.⁵ In 1512 the King began to pay £12 a year for the maintenance of her son Reginald at school; and the following year, 14th of October, 1513, he created her Countess, by her brother's second title, Salisbury, and gave her the family lands of the earldom, in fee."⁶ This, however, did not exhaust the King's idea of the reparation which was due to the Countess and her family. The original attainder of Warwick was reversed on the perfectly obvious ground that: "Being of the age of eight years, until the time of his decease, remaining and kept in ward and restrained from his liberty, as well within the Tower of London, as in other places having none experience nor knowledge of the worldly policies, nor the laws of this realm, so that, if any offense were by him done . . . it was rather by innocency than of any malicious purpose." Further, the King bestowed on Henry Pole—her eldest son—a special livery of his father's lands, namely, the manors of Illesborough and Medmenham, in Buckinghamshire, while on the 25th of September, 1513, in the church at Tournay, where the royal banner was displayed, His Majesty, after Mass, knighted him in company with forty-nine other gallant gentlemen who in battle had rendered valorous service against the followers of the French King. The family possessions were now of great extent, but they were charged with many exactions levied by Henry towards defraying the cost of his foreign warrings. One receipt exists for £1,000—upwards of £20,000 of our present money—paid by Lady Margaret, as "part payment of 5,000 marks granted of her benevo-

⁵ Equivalent to about £2,000, or \$10,000, of present-day currency.

⁶ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 8.

lence towards the King's wars . . . for his high and great goodness in restoring her to the inheritance of her brother." In June, 1513, while his brother was still at the wars, Reginald Pole began his studies at Oxford. There is an entry in his college record of the receipt by him of the first payment of a pension which the Prior thereof was bound to pay to every student nominated by the King, until released from the charge by finding for him "a competent benefice." The arrangement illustrates in convincing fashion the deplorable condition into which Church affairs had got under the baneful influence of Royal interference in their administration. How monstrously far this interference was carried is proved by the fact that when he was only seventeen years of age Reginald Pole was nominated by the King prebendary of Roscomb in the Cathedral of Salisbury, and of Gatminster-secunda in the same church; and soon after had the Deanery of Wimborne Minster bestowed on him. No doubt the boy's mother desired that he should become a priest, and his studies were directed towards this end, but at the time when the benefices named were bestowed on him he had not received even minor orders and was still a simple laic. Abbot Gasquet in his well-known work, "*Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*," says: "No less detrimental to the well-being of the Church in England at this time was the crying abuse and scandal of pluralities. . . . At this time also benefices were bestowed upon the young of good family, who had sufficient influence to secure these preferments."¹ The fact that Pole's collegiate career was one of extraordinary brilliancy in no degree excuses what took place. It is perfectly clear that at that very time the Queen was laying plans to bring about the marriage of Reginald Pole to her yet child daughter, the Princess Mary, a project about which more was to be heard in later years.

The first life of Cardinal Pole published was that written by his friend and secretary, Ludovico Beccatelli, Archbishop of Ragusa, which was printed at Venice in 1563. Referring to some of the statements in this, Mr. Haile says: "Cardinal Pole was himself Beccatelli's informant as to the events of his early life, and it is interesting to find how early the question of a marriage between the cousins—which in the days of her sorrow was again to be considered by the Queen and the Emperor—had been mooted. From that time forth, Reginald Pole's pretensions to Mary's hand were to be—so to speak—in the air, and well liked of the English people, always averse to a foreign prince as king. While it is clear that he had no ambition that way himself, he was nevertheless looked upon as numbered among the numerous candidates, and

¹ "*Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*," p. 25.

not as one of the least eligible." That Pole himself ever seriously contemplated living a secular life and entering into matrimony is, at least, doubtful, while it is certain that all his studies were essentially of a kind tending to qualify him for the ecclesiastical state. On this point Mr. Haile says:^a "Pole's own love of learning, the enthusiasm displayed by his chief preceptor, Linacre, for the '*sancta mater studiorum*,' the fact that the most distinguished among the learned men, who were his teachers or his friends, had received their education at Padua—Linacre and William Latimer, Dr. Rich- and Pace (Secretary of State and Ambassador to Venice), Lupset (his secretary), Tunstall (Bishop of Durham), Dr. Colet (Dean of St. Paul's), and many others—naturally inclined him towards that great university. He had now lived twenty years, seven of which he had spent at Oxford, 'and his mother and family consented to a step which seemed to second the hopes he had already raised both in them and the whole nation.' The consent of the King had also to be obtained, and was granted without difficulty. Henry VIII. seems to have fully shared his wife's affection for his brilliant young kinsman, though not her views as to his marriage with her daughter; he rejoiced in Reginald's learning and distinction, and notwithstanding the noble provision he had already made for his support, he gave him £100 towards his expenses for a year (equivalent to £2,000 at the present day). It was, therefore, with a princely retinue and considerable state that Pole started from England and made his journey towards Padua. It will not be amiss to give here some account of his personal appearance. Becatelli thus describes him:

"Of medium height and thin, in complexion white and red, as are commonly the English; his face a little broad, with merry and benignant eyes, and in youth his beard was rather fair—*quasi bianda*. He was robust of body, and seldom sick . . . moderate in eating, although of a healthy appetite, which ill supported fasting; he ate only twice a day, and his evening meal was slight; he slept lightly, and generally rose before dawn, to attend to his studies and devotions; he did not care for much personal service, and often got up and went to bed without assistance. In England and abroad he was noted for the chastity of his life and conversation. He was not ambitious of wealth—*di robba non fu cupido*—that which he had he spent and cheerfully gave. He wished his familia to be well treated, he avoided all debts and made his expenditure accord with his revenue.'"

It was in the spring of 1519 that the future Cardinal arrived at Padua to commence his studies in its famous university, which

^a "Life of Reginald Pole," pp. 13, 14.

had, however, suffered seriously and been almost deserted by both students and professors during the nine years between 1508 and 1517, owing to the disasters and turmoils created by the wars of the League of Cambray. On entering the city he was met by all the chief civic officials and greeted as a person of high distinction, a compliment probably inspired by knowledge of his close connection with the Crown of England, whose then holder was generally regarded as one of the most genuinely Catholic of the sovereigns of Europe. The scene, as depicted by Mr. Haile, must have been impressively brilliant. He says: "The university, still familiarly called the 'Bo,' from the fact that it stood on the place of a famous old hostelry, *Il Bove*, or the Bull Inn—which had been able to accommodate more than 600 guests, with stabling for 200 horses—had between 1,000 and 1,200 students, the same number, strange to say, as it has now. The rectors in their *togas*, the pompous Podestà and the Capitan with their officers, the students in their many-colored garments, and with flashing weapons, which the authorities were perpetually confiscating, moved about the streets with a gay contrast of coloring to the dull sameness of their present-day costume and attire. The conduct of the students, despite occasional broils and faction fights ending in bloodshed, was less turbulent than might be expected. The reports of the rectors of the Venetian Signory, as well as that of each Podestà on terminating his sixteen months of office, and of the Capitan are, on the whole, favorable.⁹ To the young Englishman exchanging the dull skies of his country for the brightness of Italy nothing can have been more satisfying to the artistic side of his nature than to find himself in such a town as Padua at the moment he arrived there; and we can hardly conceive what a training to the eye and mind of so intelligent a youth as Reginald Pole it must have been to happen upon Italy in the year of grace 1519."¹⁰ The city, its churches and colleges were growing in grandeur day by day under the hands of the greatest architects and artists of Italy, while within its halls were teaching or studying the most learned scholars of the time. Pole found himself surrounded by all those elements of culture which he loved.

In the early portion of 1525 Pole visited Rome, in order to

⁹ The retiring Podestà, in his report to the Signory, 1st March, 1519, says the students were not so steady as they had been "in ancient times." But on the same date Dr. Nicolo Michiel, advocate of the Commune, reports that little of moment has happened although the students fêted the carnival in their usual manner; but he has opened an inquiry into the death of the Veronese student, lately killed, and eight students of Verona and Vicenza have been arrested. ("Sanuto's Diary," Vol. XXVII, p. 6.)

¹⁰ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 16.

fulfill the conditions of the jubilee of that year, but he was not received by the Pope, and there is no record of his having sought an audience. Both Henry VIII. and his mother, Lady Salisbury, were pressing for his return to England, and it was with some difficulty he obtained their permission to visit the Eternal City. It was not until the beginning of 1537 he returned to his native land. As regards his educational status at this time, Mr. Haile says: "Pole had amply fulfilled his promise to Henry VIII. that he would let himself be outdone in diligence by no other student; indeed, few young men can have had less cause for self-reproach in looking back upon their university career or more reason for satisfaction at its results. Not only had he enriched his mind with useful knowledge, but by the interchange of thought with the statesmen and men of learning it had been his good fortune to frequent, had ripened his opinions upon the relations between Church and State, upon the duties and rights of rulers and their people, and had enlarged and heightened his conception of the true philosophy of life. According to the custom of the time only to begin the study of theology at a riper age, Pole had occupied himself chiefly with logic and philosophy, solidly grounding himself in every branch of the 'humanities' before entering upon his theological studies. Besides writing his 'Life of Longolius,' he had collected in his stay at Padua the various readings and emendations of Cicero's works, to which he added his own remarks, with an intent to publish a complete edition of them. 'But the exigencies his country fell into soon after, and the occasion she had for more substantial service than classic learning could yield,' caused the papers to be laid aside, then neglected and finally lost."¹¹

On his arrival in London he was received with much affection and respect, both the King and Queen and, of course, his mother and family being foremost in the general greeting. On all sides it was agreed that he was destined to fill the highest offices of state, to the holding of which his choice of the ecclesiastical life—if he adhered to it—would then have been no barrier. His latest biographer tells us that although, not long after his return to England, Reginald retired to Sheen to study theology, setting up his abode in the house built for himself by the learned Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, under the shadow of the Carthusian monastery—which had been Pole's own first school as a little boy—he found time during the next two years to make himself thorough master of the affairs of his country, to the extent of being able to assure the King, as we have seen, how closely he had studied the financial history of England. As an example of the thoroughness of his

¹¹ Phillips' "Life of Pole," Vol. I., p. 24, published in 1764.

investigations in the subjects which he thought it his duty to know, the fact is remarkable and deserving of remembrance, in considering his future life and undertakings. Although still a layman, he was elected Dean of Exeter on the 12th of August, 1527. The detestable project of the King's divorce was on the eve of being launched, and unfortunately seems to have been originated by Wolsey, who, for mingled dynastic and national reasons, desired to bring about a marriage between Henry and Margaret, the widowed Duchess of Alençon, sister of the King of France. The Cardinal does not seem to have suspected his master's infatuation for Anne Boleyn, or, if he did, to have regarded it as merely one of those immoral intrigues to which the latter was not disinclined. Mr. Haile says: "Few men can ever have been more dismayed than was Wolsey, on discovering that he had labored to dislodge the daughter of Isabella the Catholic, not in favor of a daughter of France, but of Lady Boleyn, one of the most ill-reputed women of the English Court. Cavendish reports, and probably with truth, that when the King first disclosed his intention to Wolsey, the latter fell on his knees and endeavored, without effect, to dissuade him."¹² We need not here, however, go over the story of the divorce proceedings, which occupies a considerable amount of space in Mr. Haile's admirably painstaking work. Our concern is only with the part played in connection with them by Reginald Pole.

On this point Mr. Haile says that the future Prince of the Church was brought face to face with the detested question of the divorce before he had been very long in England, and his withdrawal to Sheen was no less from a desire to get away from discussions which he could not expect to influence than in order to continue his theological studies undisturbed by the distractions of the Court. Sir Thomas More at this time shunned the Court as much as he could—

"He knew how hard it was to contend with one whose arguments he could not admit without peril of his conscience, or contradict without peril of his life. His learning, his reputation, his legal acquirements, were sure to point him out to the King as the one man above all others in the kingdom whose judgment on the question none would venture to impugn, and few would be inclined to dispute."¹³

The above words are entirely applicable to the younger man who, if his reputation was not as great as More's, had an equal integrity of mind, which could neither be blurred nor biased by his ardent gratitude and affection for Henry VIII., nor by the love

¹² "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 50.

¹³ Brewer, Introduction to Vol. IV., p. ccxx.

and reverence he bore the Queen, his constant friend, and whose great wish it had been to call him son—a wish which the poor Queen's distaste for the scheme now on foot, to deliver up her little daughter as a bride to an elderly debauchee like the King of France, no doubt revived and enhanced. The infamous and unscrupulous Thomas Cromwell, who was destined to be Wolsey's successor, was selected as a fitting instrument to sap by specious arguments Pole's integrity, but the latter's clearness of intellect and knowledge of theological teaching on the subject stood him in good stead and enabled him to reject the theories of that base intriguer with the contempt they deserved. Pole, moreover, determined that his best course was to leave England altogether, and accordingly, he sought and obtained the King's permission to proceed to Paris, in order to continue his studies in its great university. On the 12th of October, 1529, the French Ambassador at the English Court wrote to Paris announcing Pole's departure. On the same day Wolsey was dismissed from all his offices, and the whole world knew that Anne Boleyn had wrought his ruin. That God in His infinite mercy gave him another year of life in which to repent his misdeeds and that he made good use of that period of grace is matter of history. Pole was barely settled in Paris when he received a communication from the King appointing him his Ambassador to the French Court and instructing him to obtain declarations from the theologians of the university favorable to his divorce. This duty Reginald at once declined, on the score of his lack of experience and knowledge, with the result that Henry forthwith sent him a coadjutor, who was less scrupulous, and whom he received in his house, leaving him free to perform a hopeless task. Eventually, by dint of lavish bribery, a declaration from the faculty of the university favorable to the design was secured, after a prolonged and fierce discussion carried by an insignificant majority. Money was lavished in purchasing votes for this palpably worthless pronouncement. Quickly realizing that Pole was in no way inclined to aid his project, Henry recalled him to England, where he again devoted himself to his studies at Sheen. In November, 1530, he was offered the Archbishopric of York or Bishopric of Winchester if he would declare for the divorce, but the bribes were sternly rejected by Pole, who had not then received even minor orders. Henry now insisted that he should take a month to consider the matter, and during that period deluged him with courtesies and compliments, sending various ecclesiastical sycophants to pester him with arguments, but he remained steadfast in his resolve, and eventually told the King to his face that, even if he accepted either of the two preferments, he should still feel bound

to pronounce against the validity of the divorce. In February, 1532, Henry gave him permission to take up his residence on the Continent, through sheer fear that if he appeared in his place in Parliament he would denounce not only the divorce, but his assumption of the headship of the Church in England. Here again we are compelled by considerations of space to refrain from discussing in detail the monstrous events of a monstrous time, which Mr. Haile sets out most fully.

Pole had no intention of remaining in Paris, where he could be so easily pestered by missives from the King, and, accordingly, he quickly removed himself from that city to Avignon. The climate of that place, however, did not suit his health, which was never very robust, and he decided to travel to Venice by way of Carpentras, where he made the acquaintance of the famous and learned Bishop of that diocese, Giacomo Sadoletto. The result was the formation of a friendship which lasted unimpaired until the death of Sadoletto in 1547. During two years Reginald had his headquarters in Venice, but spent much of his time at Padua, continuing his theological studies. He cannot, however, have been ignorant that poor Queen Katherine and all Henry's Continental enemies were desirous that he should return to England, marry the Princess Mary and raise the country against its adulterous and sacrilegious sovereign. Constant correspondence on this subject was going on between the Queen, the Emperor and the King of France, and it is by no means improbable that, had the project been carried out, England might have been saved to the Church. Mr. Haile says: "The subject of these letters was quietly pursuing his studies at Padua and at Venice. The events occurring in England could not but stir to the depths a nature as affectionate and devoted to his country and his King as Reginald Pole's, and from this time forth a shade of mysticism and aloofness from the things of the world became perceptible in his character, and it appeared as if he deemed it impossible that an earnest man should devote himself to any but the highest studies of divinity and theology. His own helplessness to afford a remedy to the heartbreaking acts succeeding each other in England drove home the sense of the vanity of all earthly things, and forced him to turn his mind more and more to that which was transcendental. Not that his sense of humor ever forsook him, any more than his indomitable habit of looking at the best side of things, of hope unquenched by the bitterness of sad experience. The clear judgment, the quickness of wit, clothed occasionally in gentle railery, or acute irony, remained undimmed, and his conversation was the delight of all who approached him. 'Having much experience of the world,' says his

biographer, Beccatelli, 'with a beautiful manner, *con bella maniera*, he knew how to entertain each person, and did so. And among other things, I never knew a man who had so many fine maxims, *bei motti*, and comparisons as he; they seemed to flourish on his lips without the slightest affectation; and the same may be found scattered through his writings." We are further reminded by Mr. Haile that the sorely troubled life and reign of Pope Clement VII. came to an end in the month of September, 1534, and Cardinal Farnese, in a conclave which only lasted a single day—October 12—was elected to succeed him, taking the title of Paul III. The new Pontiff was a strong man and a determined reformer, intent upon assembling the General Council, which the troubled state of Europe had rendered impossible in the time of his predecessor.¹⁴ In England it was hoped that a change of Popes would bring a change in the King's attitude towards the Holy See; but when the Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Exeter ventured to suggest, on the news of Clement VII.'s illness, that the King would make no difficulty as a Catholic prince in obeying the new Pope, "he answered that no one should mock him by advising such a thing, for he would have no greater regard for any Pope that might be chosen than for the meanest priest in his kingdom." In 1535 began the terrible series of executions or martyrdoms by which Henry sought to crush all further opposition to the validity of his divorce and assumption of the headship of the Church in England. On the 29th of April Richard Reynolds, a monk of the Bridgettine monastery of Lyon, with the priors of the three charterhouses of London, Aucholm and Bellevue, were executed because of their rejection of the King's supremacy. Mr. Haile says: "It would be interesting to know whether the news of the death of the Carthusians had reached Rome when, on the 20th of May, the Pope held a consistory and created seven Cardinals, one of whom is thus described in the *Diaria Pontificum*: 'John, Bishop of Rochester, kept in prison by the King of England.'" In either case the Pope, by this open act of honor and approval, testified to his regard

¹⁴ Pietro Balan, in his "Storia di Clemente VII.," justifies that Pope against the accusation of not seriously desiring a general council or the reform of the Roman Curia, showing how he had appointed a commission, of which Giberti, the illustrious Datario and Bishop of Verona, was a member, for the express purpose of reforming the clergy of Rome. "If the work commenced under such favorable auspices failed to produce its full effects, the fault cannot be attributed to lack of good-will in the Pope, but to the political complications which disturbed his pontificate. The same Clement addressed breves to all Christian princes, exhorting them to make peace, in order that a general council might be held for the reform of abuses." (G. B. Fighi, "Gianmatteo Giberti, Vescovo di Verona," Verona, 1900. Quoted in Haile's "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 132.)

for Fisher's sanctity and fidelity. He may have hoped that the red robe, symbol of the blood Cardinals must ever be ready to shed in defense of the Church, might in this case be a protection from the wrath of the King; and men held their breath to see what Henry would do, while Paul III. recommended the new Cardinal to the good offices of the King of France, and explained that in raising the Bishop of Rochester to the purple, he did so in view of the General Council, to which he meant to call all the most learned men of the different countries of Christendom. Henry did not keep the world waiting long for his answer to the Pope's elevation of Fisher; on the 22d of June the new Cardinal's head was struck off on Tower Hill, and on the 6th of July the same fate was awarded to Sir Thomas More, ex-Lord Chancellor of England."¹⁸ Meantime a servile priest, Thomas Starkey, who had acted as Pole's chaplain and secretary in France and Italy, had been appointed one of the royal chaplains and was set the impossible task of obtaining from Reginald a letter of approval of the King's proceeding. Presuming on their former acquaintance, this wretched man simply deluged Pole with communications begging him to write to the effect stated. In the consistory at which the Pope nominated the martyr Bishop of Rochester a Cardinal he also announced his intention of bestowing the red hat on Gaspar Contarini, and one of the first acts of that illustrious Cardinal after taking up his residence in Rome was to write to the Empress Charles V. on June 5, 1535, extolling the ability and virtues of Reginald Pole and pointing out that the latter was convinced that the most likely way of winning back England to the Church was not by force of arms, but "by peace and persuasion." Looking back upon the history of the period it is impossible not to recognize that Pole was right. The use of the armies and navies of France and Spain to reëstablish Papal supremacy was, of course, enough to rally to the support of Henry all the instincts of nationality and material patriotism. Later on, in the days of Elizabeth, the same mistake was made, and English Catholics, perfectly loyal to the Holy See and the Church, were foremost in the work of defeating and destroying the Spanish Armada. Already eminent Bishops and others were beginning to express the hope that the Holy Father might see his way to elevate Pole to the Cardinalate in place of the martyred Fisher.

In England, Henry had set certain time-serving prelates to write books in defense of his assumption of the headship of the Church.

¹⁸ Three centuries later, under the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII., the Carthusians, Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, received the honor of beatification.

Foremost among these were Richard Sampson, Bishop of Chichester, and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Their works were soon in the hands of Pole, who had already begun one of his own to the directly contrary effect. This was written in consequence of the persistent appeals of Starkey for an expression of opinion favorable to the King. Its title was "*Pro Ecclesiasticæ, Unitatus Defensione*," and the first copy issued from the press was sent to Henry. This tremendous and scathing denunciation of the King's crimes was entrusted to Michael Throckmorton for conveyance to London, accompanied by a letter from Pole, the messenger being instructed to place both in the hands of His Majesty. In his letter the writer said:

" . . . first of your chaplain, Mr. Starkey, and afterwards of Mr. Secretary, of your Grace's pleasure that I should declare to you my opinion touching the Pope's supremacy, with other articles, and to state my reasons. I have done so, accordingly, in a book which I send by the bearer. How it will satisfy you, He only knows in whose hand are the hearts of kings.

"If you wish further information of my purpose, I refer you to the bearer. . . . Venice, May 27."

Throckmorton was further instructed to inform the King that Pole's work was a reply to his own challenges and to the false reasonings of Gardiner and Sampson. The present is not the place to examine in detail the arguments advanced by Pole in defense of Papal supremacy. It must suffice to say that these were conclusive and overwhelming. One extract may, however, be quoted to show its absolute fearlessness and the entire disregard of its author for those enormous family interests which he knew were at the mercy of the Tudor savage. Pole wrote:

"Are titles given for nothing, or for less than nothing, that men should call you, the robber and persecutor of the Church, the 'head of the Church?' Your father was a penurious man, but even he founded a few monasteries for the care of the poor; but who can cite any good deed of yours? What are your public works? Pleasure-houses, built for your own gratification, ruined monasteries, wrecked churches, their possessions confiscated to the Crown. . . .

"You have destroyed your nobles on the most frivolous pretenses; you have filled your Court with worthless men, to whom you have yielded everything up. But what shall I say of the butcheries; of the dreadful executions which have made England the slaughter-houses of the innocent? The holiest and most spotless men, for the new crimes invented by yourself, put to death in the most horrible and unheard of manner. The gracious Bishop of Rochester, the unparalleled More, the learned Reynolds and so many others were

the victims of your senseless and wicked fury. In their bloody death no torment was spared to them nor any insult to their religion. All nations mourned when they heard of those frightful tragedies, and even now, after so long a time, tears, as I write, come to my eyes. And you are the man who holds that the Pope, on account of his moral deficiencies, cannot be head of the Church."

The work ended with an almost pathetic appeal to the King to take count of the peril to which his soul was exposed, to repent his sins and make atonement for them, thus deserving the mercy of God. In face, however, of the absolute determination of Henry to do none of these things, an immediate result of Pole's labors was to make his return to his native land impossible, even if he had been desirous of going there. Both Henry and his astute counsellor, Cromwell, however, urged him to do so, but it is most probable that, if he had done so, an early excuse would have been found for his impeachment as a traitor and for his immediate execution. Regarded from their point of view, his guilt was even greater than that of More.

On the 19th of July, 1536, the Pope summoned Pole to Rome, with a view to his participation in the General Council. The Papal letter was a most complimentary one, and concluded by desiring his attendance in virtue of holy obedience. Only one answer was possible, and Pole replied at once; promising to obey the summons, although, with characteristic humility, he avowed his own profound belief in his inability to be of practical service. Before leaving for Rome, however, he wrote, on the 31st of August, to Cardinal Contarini, telling him the latest news he had received from the English Ambassador in Paris. In this letter he told how in England:

"Some nobles are condemned to extreme punishment; and he¹⁶ who had begun courageously to vindicate the Pope's authority in Ireland, and had afterwards surrendered to the King on a promise of pardon, has been condemned with his four uncles; also a brother of the Duke of Norfolk for secretly marrying a daughter of the late Queen of Scotland, has been condemned to death along with his wife.¹⁷ . . . But I rather think that in these cases the King wishes an opportunity of showing mercy, and that is why judgment has been passed upon them; for their deaths would be so unjust

¹⁶ Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, generally known as "Silken Thomas," owing to the magnificence of his attire.

¹⁷ Lord Thomas Howard and Lady Margaret Douglas. The latter was pardoned, but her husband was kept captive in the Tower, while "Silken Thomas" and his four uncles were executed in London. The object, of course, was to destroy a family who possessed far more influence in Ireland than the King. Aliens in race though they originally were, they had become more Irish than the Irish themselves.

as to create intolerable hatred, the Irishman having relied on a public promise, and the others being condemned only on an *ex-post facto* law. We shall soon know."

In October Pole arrived in Rome, being received with great affection by the Holy Father and provided with apartments in the Papal palace. He was at once appointed a member of the Commission nominated by the Pope to undertake the organization of the Council. Almost on the eve of Christmas, His Holiness determined to create him a Cardinal, but he strongly objected that his elevation would be likely to deprive him of whatever influence for good he possessed in England, as his acceptance of a place in the Sacred College would certainly be misrepresented by the King and his creatures. The Pope, however, was not affected by his protests, and on the 22d of December he was appointed to the Cardinalate with eleven others. This is not the place in which to recount all Pole's wonderful work in connection with the Council or his general services to the Church, but these deserve at least some notice, as assuredly do his exertions as Papal Legate at the Court of Queen Mary, but this must be deferred for another article.

WALTER F. DESTERRE.

THE QUESTION OF ALBERT DUERER'S RELIGION.

AMONGST the numerous evils which sprang from the outburst of the Protestant revolt which is familiarly called, but improperly so, the Reformation, the most deplorable and disastrous was the impulse which the habit of lying, that followed in its wake, imbibed therefrom. The crime of bearing false witness became almost general. In every country of Europe, wherever the seeds of revolt had taken hold in the soil, the pen of the forger soon became busy in the manufacture of damaging evidence wherewith to bolster up the claims of covetous and malignant neighbors and kinsmen, in cases wherein landed or personal property was the stake that was to be played for, whether in the royal court or the rural squire's modest holding. We have shown how important a part the skill of the forger played in the condemnation of the hapless Mary Stuart of Scotland. Her case was only one in thousands. Perjury in the courts was the inevitable corollary to the falsehood of the pen. Lying and deception formed part of the everyday life of whole communities in those countries where the axe of the "Reformation" had split the community in twain.

Protestant writers claim Duerer as one of themselves. They do

so on the ground that many expressions of sympathy with Martin Luther are found in the painter's letters and his diary. It is true that he painted a small picture for Luther and presented it to him; but this is not at all to be wondered at. Luther had not then broken away from the Church, but he was attracting great notoriety by his preaching, tentative, merely, at this stage, not positive, as it became later on, when he felt secure in the protection of the Elector and other recalcitrant nobles of Germany. Later, when Luther's preaching became open war and rebellion against the Papal authority, his friends, becoming alarmed for his personal safety, got up a bogus seizure of his person by the troops of the Elector, and a mock imprisonment. Whether Albert Duerer was in the secret of the real nature of this proceeding or not, it is difficult to say; but one may be excused if he conclude from the gush and lamentation that he pours out over the transaction, in his diary, that he was quite aware of the mockery of the whole business and tried to hide it by making the loudest outcry he possibly could, in order to pretend that his grief was genuine. This diary, we may be sure, was shown by the painter to his friends—and he had a very great number of these who used to make of his studio a regular rendezvous for gossiping and criticism and what not else. Here are a few specimens of the stage-play hyperbole:

"Item: On the Friday before Whitsuntide, in the year 1521, the report reached me at Antwerp that Martin Luther had been treacherously taken prisoner, for the herald of the Emperor Charles, to whose care he was committed under the imperial safe-conduct, on arriving at an unfriendly place near Eisenach, rode off, saying that he dared stay no longer with him. Immediately ten horsemen appeared, who treacherously carried off the pious man sold into their hands. He was a man enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and a follower of the true Christian faith. Whether he lives still, or whether his enemies have murdered him, I know not, but he has suffered much for Christ's sake, and because he has rebuked the unchristian Papacy, which strives against the freedom of Christ with its heavy burdens of human laws. . . .

"O God, is Luther dead? Who will henceforth explain to us so clearly the Holy Gospel? Alas, what might not he still have written for us during the next ten or twenty years? Oh, all pious Christian men, bewail with me this God-inspired man, and pray to God to send us another enlightened teacher. O Erasmus of Rotterdam, where dost thou remain? Behold how the unjust tyranny of this world's might and the powers of darkness prevail. Hear, thou knight of Christ; ride forth in the name of the Lord,

defend the truth, attain the martyr's crown; thou art already an old mannikin (*Maenniken*), and I have heard thee say that thou givest thyself only two years longer in which thou wilt still be fit for work. Employ these well, then, in the cause of the Gospel and the true Christian faith. Lift up thy voice, and so shall not the gates of hell (the See of Rome) as Christ saith, prevail against thee. And although, like thy master, Christ, thou hast to suffer shame on earth, and even die a short time sooner than thou otherwise might, yet wilt thou pass the sooner from death unto life, and be glorified through Christ. For if thou drinkest of the cup of which He drank, so wilt thou reign with Him, and judge justly those who have not acted righteously. O Erasmus, hold to this, and put thy boast in the Lord, as it stands written in David, for thou canst do this, and, in truth, thou mayest prevail to fell this Goliath; for God will uphold His holy Christian Church according to His divine will. May He give us eternal bliss, who is God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, one eternal God. Amen.

"Oh, all ye Christian men, pray to God for help, for His judgment draws nigh, and His righteousness shall be made plain. Then we shall see the blood of the innocent, which Popes, Bishops and monks have spilt, rise up in judgment and condemn them. (*Apocal.*) And these are the souls of the slain that lie under the altar of God and cry for vengeance, unto which the voice of God replies: 'Fill up the measure with the innocent who are slain, then will I judge.'"

One can readily imagine that in writing this the sly Albert was making a deadly thrust at the vacillating runagate, Erasmus of Rotterdam, who had, frightened at the noise he had helped his friend Martin to make, fled in the night-time and placed himself out of the jurisdiction of the German law officers. The passage in the diary which immediately follows after the outburst we have quoted above is of a grotesquely contrary character. It is, in fact, mundane in the most sordid degree, as will be seen. It runs thus:

"I have reckoned with Jobet, and I owe him 31 florins, and I have paid him, taking into account and deducting two portraits painted in oil colors, for which he gave me out 5 pounds. In all my painting, boarding, selling and other dealings I have had disadvantage in the Netherlands, in all my concerns with high and low; and especially has the Lady Margaret, for all that I have presented her and done for her, given me nothing. And this settling with Jobst was on St. Peter and St. Paul's Day. I gave the Rudiger servant 7 stivers to drink. . . .

"Item. On the Sunday before St. Margaret's Day the King of Denmark gave a grand banquet to the Emperor, the Lady Margaret and the Queen of Spain, and invited me, and I, too, ate there. I

gave 12 stivers for the King's futtural, and I painted the King in oil colors, and he gave me 30 florins." The "King's futtural" was a kind of customary "tip," or "largesse," as the mediæval phrase put it.

It must be owned by the most ardent advocate of the sincerity of the painter's sympathy with "the pious man," Martin Luther, that the grief he had just previously expressed for him by no means deranged the great artist's love for orderly business methods and careful keeping of accounts.

Deceit and dissimulation pervaded the European atmosphere. It was everywhere. The Continent was a house divided against itself. Division reigned at the domestic hearth, whether it was in the baron's hall or the peasant's shieling. Who began that work? It was Luther. At the very outset of his meeting he began to play the game of duplicity boldly, not behind backs, but in the face of all the world. He had published his "Theses," proclaiming in effect that man is justified by faith and not by his good works, no matter how many, and when these were attacked he wrote (in May, 1518): "I care little what pleases or displeases the Pope. He is a man like other men. . . . I listen to the Pope as Pope—that is, when he speaks in the canons agreeably to the canons, or regulates any matters conjointly with a council—but not when he speaks of his own mind."

A few days later after this insolent and uncalled-for defiance of the Holy Father's authority as head of the Church Universal, he whiningly appeals to the object of his fuming scorn, in these terms:

"I throw myself at the feet of your Holiness, and submit myself to you, with all that I have and all that I am. Destroy my cause, or espouse it; take my life, or restore it, as you please: I will receive your voice as that of Christ Himself, who presides and speaks through you. If I have deserved death, I refuse not to die; the earth is the Lord's, and all that therein is. May He be praised forever and ever. May He maintain you to all eternity! Amen."

While he was writing these words the arch-hypocrite was taking careful measure to place himself where he could not be held accountable for his outrageous contumacy. He was getting into the plot to have himself carried off—"moryah!" as the Irish say—as a prisoner by the zealous "Catholic" champion, the Elector of Saxony! He was lighting the torch which was to be the signal for war all over the European Continent—war that lasted for more than a hundred years. He was laying the foundation stone of a temple to the Father of Lies—and he began it, as we have seen, with a most horrible set of lies on his own lips! Little wonder is

it that this illustrious example soon had many distinguished imitators. Little wonder that an admiring friend, or pretended admirer, like Albert Duerer, should take the hint. He had to deal with admirers of the arch-hypocrite, as well as his enemies. His business was at stake. It was most essential that he buy a mask and wear it. Lying was now no disgrace; it was quite the vogue. Machiavelli had not written "The Prince" for nothing. Luther had pleaded to the Pope that his "warm, youthful blood" may have led him astray, but having gone on a wrong track, he refused to be set right! It was not until he arose, says the artless D'Aubigne, that Truth arose to illumine the night of European ignorance. What sublime audacity!

Luther began his apology by a remarkable statement. "Nothing was heard in all the taverns," he commenced, "but complaints of the avarice of the priests, attacks on the power of the Keys and of the supreme Bishop." This was ingenuous, no doubt, but it inevitably suggests the identity of the sources of inspiration which are indicated in Meissonier's famous painting called "La Rixe" and the beginning of the "Reformation." Dr. Martin Luther must have been no novice in the life of the underworld. He knew all about the gossip of the taverns. He was more familiar, in his furtive callow days, with the language of the slums and the taverns than with the conversation of the pious and God-fearing. He had, as he said himself later on, "eaten his peck of salt with the Devil," and knew the taste of the commodity right well! Luther did not stop to tell whence he gleaned his information about the nature of the gossip in the taverns. But the positive way in which he asserted that it was such as he described shows that either he had invented it for the purpose of his argument or that he had made himself perfectly conversant with the condition of affairs he limned out so boldly. The hand that "drew Priam's curtain at the dead of night" had witnessed the beginning of the conflagration about which he had come to tell.

It is argued by those who wish to present Albert Duerer as an apostate that he drew the inspiration for his greatest and most beautiful paintings from the Sacred Scriptures—the book which, as one of the mendacious tribe remarks, "the Pope had so long withheld from Christendom." It may be asked how, if the Pope had withheld it, Albert Duerer managed to get hold of it. Before the words "Protestant" and "Reformation" had ever been heard in the world other painters no less great than Albert Duerer had drawn their inspiration from the same sacred source as he did. The art of printing from movable types was no secret of any of the Popes; they had to wait until it was invented to take advan-

tage of the discovery to spread the knowledge of the Bible, and they lost no time about doing so once the printing press and the movable types became practicable realities. Every honest scholar knows this; it is only the charlatans who make a living by trading on the ignorance of the bigoted section of mankind who dares to assert now that the Popes kept the Bible from the people. The most glorious era in art had its zenith in the period immediately preceding the advent of the coarse and inartistic Reformer; he was the precursor of an epoch when art and religion were represented to be natural enemies, and the spirit of the Vandal desecrated the holy things and places of the Church, in the much-abused name of simplicity in worship. The Puritan looked upon such men as Duerer as aiders and abettors of a cult worse than pagan idolatry and superstition. One of those twisters and distorters of history and fact says: "As Luther preached the Crucified One as the centre of all religious life, whom the Pope had placed in the background, so Duerer also was active as a reformer when he sought to serve with his art, not the Pope and the Church, but Christ as the only Counsellor and Saviour." (*"Illustrated Home Journal."*) There is nothing whatever in Duerer's artistic work to suggest any such design or intention on the part of the great Germano-Hungarian artist. The same authority that thus speaks of Luther and Duerer dwells admiringly on Luther's depictions of the Virgin Mary and the beautiful home life of the house of Joseph in Bethlehem. Why, nothing could be more furiously denounced than the Catholic idea of honor to the Mother of the Saviour was by this same ranting, blasphemous reformer, and none knew it better than his contemporary, Albert Duerer.

Duerer was in, his own way, a great artist, but he had his limitations. Da Vinci, Perugino, Rafael Sanzio, Michael Angelo, were great artists before his time; but they had no limitations—in the artistic sense. Their differing genius knew no bounds. They were "super-men," it is hardly hyperbole to say. And it was the sublime Church that the furious German doctor attacked that gave them the inspiration and the means of developing their thought and employing it to further the work of glorifying God in their superhuman art. D'Aubigne, writing of the influence of the Reformation upon poetry and music and religion, endeavors to obscure the reign of trash in words and flabbiness in melody which the new hymns inaugurated—and which prevails in many places to the present day—and so to becloud the truth as to Albert Duerer. He says, without giving any data whatever to support his contention:

"Albert Duerer was one of those who were attracted by the

Word of Truth, and from that time a new impulse was given to his genius. His masterpieces were produced subsequently to his conversion. It might have been discerned, from the style in which he thenceforward depicted the Evangelists and Apostles, that the Bible had been restored to the people, and that the painter derived thence a depth, power, life and dignity which he never would have found within himself."

The ambiguity which covers all this passage is of a piece with the spirit of uncertainty and dishonesty which the Lutheran campaign almost everywhere produced. The law of self-preservation and self-interest took the place of the law of charity and brotherhood in Christ which is the spirit of the Catholic Church, and which was sedulously taught by the preaching orders all over Europe until the forsworn rebel appeared to banish it from the European stage for many dismal years.

D'Aubigne pretended that a new impulse came into Duerer's life from the constantly varying opinions—no one can truly call them doctrines—of Luther, after he had begun his downward career. A new idea may have come into his head, it may fairly be allowed; society, he saw, was to be henceforth two-sided. His patrons were among the rich, and the rich were the most divided of all. There is no mention in his diary of his having formally thrown in his lot with Luther's party, and the references he makes in the diary to the pretended kidnapping may have been put there to please friends who frequented his studio and conceal his real sentiments. His intimate friend, Pirkheimer, mentions nothing relative to such an important turn in the artist's life. His spouse, Agnes Frey, was a steadfast Catholic and a most imperious partner, and we are inclined to believe that he dreaded her tongue too much to take any step that would draw her wrath upon him. During his sojourn in Venice in 1506 he candidly confessed his insignificance in his own domicile, thus: "Here I am a lord; at home a mere nobody!" This is from one of the letters to his friend, Pirkheimer, reproduced in the "*Taschenbuch*," published on the occasion of his third centenary celebration, held at Nuernberg, in 1828. There are no entries in his diary that bear out the suggestion that he was influenced in his conceptions of art by the tenets of the Lutheran school. On the contrary, he frankly avows the influence wrought on his mind by the painters of the Italian school whom he met, and whose works he was carefully studying while on his travels abroad. Not one of these had any knowledge of Luther or his movement; they would assuredly have laughed at him and it, or despised the whole thing could they have any pre-glimmering of it. Duerer certainly profited by his travels in

Italy, and his technique underwent a change for the better when he returned. This is evidently the sole ground upon which the theory that his mind was affected by the new doctrines as to religion and art that came in when the note of revolt had been sounded in Germany.

The first German painter to break from the traditions of the stiff and stereotyped Byzantine school that prevailed over Europe until the fourteenth century was John Van Eyck. He was a native of the Netherlands and flourished about the middle of that period. Goethe, who was a leviathan in criticism on art and poetry, gives Van Eyck the palm of superiority in the movement away from the rigid, the unsentimental and the sombre in art which began in the thirteenth century—the greatest of all centuries, as Dr. Walsh so triumphantly shows. Of that movement Goethe wrote:

"But now a gladsome feeling of nature breaks suddenly through the air—and that not as a mere imitation of individual reality; it is a genial reveling of the eyesight, as though their first opening upon the sensible world. Apple-cheeked boys and girls, egg-shaped faces of men and women; comfortable-looking old men and women, with curling or flowing beards; the whole race good, pious and cheerful, and although sufficiently individualized, collectively embodied by a delicate and tender pencil. So with respect to the colors. These are cheerful, clear—aye, and powerful, too, without especial harmony, but likewise without gaudiness and always agreeable and pleasing to the eye. . . . We do not hesitate to place our Eyck in the first class of those whom nature has endowed with pictorial faculties. His compositions possess great truth and loveliness. He was a right-thinking and right-feeling artist."

Van Eyck is regarded as the founder of the Flemish school of painting, and Durer was one of those whose ideas of art were based largely on what he had learned in that school. It was not until he had learned much therein that he began to travel and observe what other schools—chiefly Italian—had to teach. He confesses much in his diary as to their effect on his imagination and style, as we shall see. But perhaps it may be more in sequential order to put in brief form the causes which led him to bend his steps across the Alps and to the banks of the Tiber, in quest of the inspiration of painting.

It appears from the biographers of the Durer family that its origin was Hungarian and rural. But Albert's grandfather, Antony Durer, had no bucolic tastes like his sires', but rather artistic ones. He moved away from the village of Eytas, where they had vegetated, to the town of Jula, and there became a goldsmith's appren-

tice. The custom of "apprenticing" was a great factor in the spreading of art in the Middle Ages—for boys came to the great centres to learn trades and pick up the ideas of the ateliers and readily gave their time to clever artisans or great artists, asking no reward but the privilege of observing the masters' methods of work. At Jula he married and brought up his eldest son, Albert, to his own business, while another son became a priest at Wardein. Albert the goldsmith traveled much in order to improve himself "under the great artists," as the Netherlands goldworkers were called, and, settling down in Nuremberg in the year 1455, married his master's daughter, Barbara Haller. Albert, the great painter, was the second son of the family they reared—eleven sons and seven daughters they numbered, all told. He had been taught a good deal of the goldsmith's art by his father when he discovered that he possessed a greater taste for the arts of drawing and painting. The future great master in these arts relates his early stirrings very modestly and ingenuously in one of the numerous Duerer family "relics" displayed at the centenary. He began the work in the spirit, seemingly, of a man who believed he was discharging a duty to posterity as well as to his forbears and contemporary society:

"I, Albert Duerer, the younger, have put together, out of my father's papers, whence he was, how he came hither and remained here, and ended blessedly. God be gracious to him and us! Amen."

Albert was pious both by heritage and natural bent, but he could be jovial and rollicking whenever care free, as most artists are, but it was his lot to have few such intervals as soon as he became tied to the wheel of the matrimonial car. Of his father and his own early tastes he wrote:

"He had especial pleasure in me, as he saw that I was diligent in learning; therefore he let me go to school, and when I had learned reading and writing he took me out of the school and taught me goldsmith's craft. But now, when I could work neatly, my inclination led me more to painting than to goldsmith's craft; and that I set forth to my father; but he was not well content, for it repented him of the time that I had spent in learning to be a goldsmith; yet he gave way, and on St. Andrew's Day, when 1486 years were reckoned from the birth of Christ, my father bound me to Michael Wohlgemuth for my apprenticeship to serve him for three years. In that time God gave me industry, so that I learned well, but had much to suffer from his men; and when my servitude was ended, my father sent me out, and I remained abroad for four years, until my father called me back; and as in the year 1490, I had gone eastwards away, so now, when 1494 were

reckoned, I came back after Whitsuntide; and when I was come home, Hans Frey dealt with my father and gave me to wife his daughter, by name Maid Agnes, and gave me with her two hundred gulden."

It might be thought, from such a seemingly auspicious beginning, that a rich prize fell into the young artist's hands when he was led to the hymeneal altar by the two considerate parents. But if he ever really got the money into his hands, poor dupe, it was only to see it vanish like conjurers' coins. Duerer's "frau" was like a magnet in regard to the money that her young husband earned. She soon proved herself to be one of the race of Xantippe—a shrew that could never be shamed or tamed, and a miser to whom no glut could bring satiety. That sort of unhappy rich are well depicted in the works of a Dutch master who wrought about Duerer's time, or a little earlier. His picture of "The Misers" helps one to realize in some measure what sort of a lot and a companionship it was to which the great painter was doomed in his Nuremberg home, after he had settled down there with his bride. He had there been accorded the diploma of a master painter by the city authorities, after he had completed his four years of "wanderschaft" studying, as was the habit of the day, the works of the earlier masters of the German and Flemish schools. The work which gained for him the reward he coveted, it is curious to note, was a pagan, not a Christian subject. It was Orpheus in the hands of the furious Bacchantes, after he had incurred their anger. It is remarkable that such should have been the choice of an artist who is so highly lauded as the particular painter of Protestant ideas of Christianity. Orpheus was an artist, too—that is to say, the myth so represents him. But his genius did not avail to save him from the lash of the tarmagant tongue, as cruel to his sensitive mind as the ferocity of the Mœnad Bacchantes. The earlier years of his married life must have been intolerably irksome because of his greedy wife's nagging for money. Many of his letters to his friend Pirkheimer and a few others are filled with dolorous complaints about the small prices paid for his artistic work, the dearth of ultramarine and other indispensable pigments, the scarcity of something to drink at home—for Duerer seems to have been a German in this regard. The naiveté with which these trifles were dilated on and grumbled about reveal a childish sort of mind, but never a sore or resentful one. If he suffered from the acidulated temper of his wife—of which there is not the least doubt he did—he carefully repressed any temptation to exhibit his trouble for the purpose of eliciting the sympathy of his friends.

Although for a long time he did not get extravagant prices for his pictures, the artist's fame was steadily spreading and winning the encomiums of the real cognoscenti. This was strikingly proved by the fact that a Venetian engraver, Marco Antonio by name, had copied some wood cuts of his and passed them off as originals, imitating even Duerer's artistic sign-manual, the professional monogram. The injured artist sought legal redress, and in order to obtain it he was obliged to journey to the great city on the Adriatic, then rising rapidly into artistic fame herself by the works of a noble school of thought and color. Duerer won his case, and his sojourn in Venice brought him much pleasure and considerably widened his circle of friends.

Some notion of the state of relations among painters, musicians and the dilettanti in Italy at that time (A. D. 1506) may be gleaned from Duerer's letters to his friend Pirkheimer. In one dated "the Saturday after Candlemas" he said:

"I wish you were here at Venice; there are so many pleasant companions among the Italians, who, the longer the more, consort with me, so that it touches one's heart; for reasonable, learned, good lute players, fifers, good judges of painting and noble-minded, right virtuous persons do me great honor and friendship. On the other hand, there are also here the falsest, most lying, thievish knaves, as I believe none such exist on the face of the earth; and he who should not know it would think them the pleasantest people in the world. I myself cannot choose but laugh at them when they talk with me; they know that one knows such wickedness of them, but they care nothing about the matter. I have many good friends amongst the Italians, who warn me not to eat and drink with their painters; and indeed many of these are my enemies, and copy my things in the churches and wherever they can get at them, and then revile them, and say they are not after the antique fashion, and therefore not good; but Sambelliny" (Giovanni Bellini, Titian's master, called Zan Belin, in Venetian patois), "he has praised me very highly and before many gentlemen. He would fain have something of mine, and came to me himself and prayed me to do something and he would pay me well for it; and all people tell me he is so worthy a man that I equally value him. He is very old, and is still the best at painting."

This is a characteristic artist's letter, showing at once the pettiness and the magnanimity of the spirit of the studios in that age of Venetian greatness. When Shakespeare speaks of "a super-subtle Venetian," he must have had a good many talks with men who had an intimate knowledge of the Venetian temperament and

the tendency of the wasps of the "Bride of the Sea" to hide under the roses in the gardens of the dream city of the Adriatic.

There is a picture of Rembrandt, painted by himself, showing the great Dutch artist enjoying himself at home, with his "frau," in a little domestic bacchanal festivity. Rembrandt and Durer were somewhat similar in tastes, it is permissible to conjecture, but their home conditions were much alike. Durer got no stimulus to do anything great in art at home. His wife was a mere taskmistress, calling out, "like the daughter of the horse-leech, 'Give, give.'" He enjoyed the immunity which his Italian journey afforded; some of his letters to Pirkheimer would suggest that the enjoyment was at times riotous. He shuddered at the thought of the return to the gray skies and monotonous flats of Holland. But when the unwelcome day came he found a royal welcome awaiting him, if not in his own home, at least all over the old city of Nuremberg. He was elected a member of the great Municipal Council—an extraordinary honor, for the city was the capital of a self-governed republic, although a member of the German Federal Empire. Kings and princes paid court to him and sat for their portraits. The Emperor Maximilian appointed him his court painter, at yearly salary of a hundred gulden, besides separate payment for all pictures he bespoke or bought.

As in the case of Henry VIII. and Hans Holbein, there is a tradition relative to Durer and the Emperor. The painter was drawing on a wall in presence of Maximilian and some courtiers when the ladder began to slip. The Emperor told the noble personage nearest to the ladder to hold it, but this did not suit his ideas of the dignity due to his rank, and so he beckoned to a servant to come forward and hold the unstable foothold. Maximilian was very indignant and told the man of hauteur that Durer's rank in art raised him far above noble station, inasmuch as he (the Emperor) could transform a peasant into a Count of the Holy Roman Empire, but nobody could transform a nobleman into a Durer.

It would seem that all the distinction and homage paid to the artist were the cause of a feeling the reverse of delightful to his jealous and avaricious wife. She was unnoticed and unmentioned while he was on that round of pleasure. Therefore, she made up her mind that she would be on the spot if any similar occasion arose. Not for fourteen years did the opportunity arise. In 1500 he, accompanied by his wife, set out on a long journey through the Netherlands. He kept a record of the journey, the places where he stopped and was entertained and honored, and he is very precise in the narrative, setting down each item of expense most

minutely and what it was for. At the same time he mentions some particulars that indicate he was painting and engraving pictures of the Blessed Virgin and the saints and the story of the Passion, just as he did when he started out on his artistic career, and with no reference to Luther and his revolt, save the one that we have noted earlier in order to support the belief that it was insincere. He begins his itinerary with these remarkable entries:

"On Thursday after St. Kilian's Day, I, Albert Duerer, at my own cost and charges, set out for Nuremberg, for the Netherlands, and the same day we passed Erlang, and lay that night at Baiersdorf, and there we spent 3 batzen, less 6 pfennige. Thence I drove to Bamberg and gave the Bishop a painted Marienbild (image of the Blessed Virgin) and copperplates to the value of a gulden; he invited me as his guest, and gave me a *zoll-brief* and three *fürder-briefe*."

The illustrated periodical from which we have quoted some references to Duerer and his work makes a great effort to show that he had no inspiration to paint in the elevated spiritual style that he is said to have acquired late in life until the Pope's ban upon the Bible had been lifted by the Reformation. Nothing could be more at variance with the facts. Duerer had always painted from the Bible, whenever he was so minded—before Luther's time and after it. He painted Madonnas and saints continuously, as his diaries show. The so-called Reformation must have had an adverse effect upon his professional fortunes—to some extent at least. What remains to us, says the biographer of the "*Taschenbuch*," "form only a small part of his productions, the works of the older masters in Germany having suffered cruelly from the insane iconoclastic zeal of the fanatical sects which swarmed at the era of the Reformation."

There is not a sentence to show that he ever formally joined the Reformers, as claimed by some of their publications. His life-long friend, Pirkheimer, whom we have already quoted, tells about his death, goes no farther than to say that he lived like an honest Christian man and died a most Christian and blessed death, and so he hoped that God would be gracious and merciful to him—a saying that indicated the Catholic beliefs in the reward and punishment of the just and the sinner, respectively, and consequently the belief in Purgatory.

As for his wife, there is no question whatever about her religion. She may have been a shrew, she may have been "curst," as the word went in the Middle Age days in the English language—but she did not mix the tenets of her religion as her husband did his pigments. She may have seen and felt and experienced many

griefs and vexations that the wives of popular artists often have to bear in silence. She was a Catholic, and an unwavering one, in a reeling time, and so she has no share in the halo that encircles the brow of her husband.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

CRITICISMS IN KANT.

KANT AND THE DEDUCTION OF THE CATEGORIES.

WHAT is the value of our empirical knowledge? Ever since Des Cartes flung in among the philosophers the apple of discord, the great problem about which the sophists have been wrangling is: What do we really know? All modern philosophy revolves around this problem. The staggering distinction set up by Des Cartes gave a new and completely unexpected turn to metaphysical speculation. The great intellects since his day have tried to grapple with the strange difficulty, each after its own fashion; while among the minor lights of philosophical thought, the Cartesian doubt at once set up a whirligig of theory, and sent feather-weight philosophers whirling into all sorts of eccentric orbits. Alone among philosophers since Des Cartes' day, Leibnitz seems to have maintained his intellectual balance. Locke attempted to give us a keen, but wholly ineffectual anatomy of the human mind. Berkeley pushed the Cartesian postulate to one logical extreme. Hume settled down to a morose, querulous and aggressive skepticism. Then came Kant. He undertook to settle the question for all time, elaborated his abstruse and original theory from the depths of his own inner consciousness, called it the true and only "science of metaphysic," pompously announced that it was a precious treasure which he was going to bequeath as a legacy to posterity—a perfect science of "absolute completeness;" so complete, indeed, that "nothing will remain for (said) posterity, but to arrange everything according to its own views for didactic purposes, without being able to add anything to the subject itself." His own proud manifesto informs us:

"In this work I have chiefly aimed at completeness, and I venture to maintain that there ought not to be one single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or to the solution of which the key at least has not been supplied."

Whole swarms of second and third-rate intellects, such as Fichte, Schelling and Hegel in Germany, Hamilton, Menzel and Spencer in Great Britain, as well as others of greater or lesser note in all quarters of the globe, settled down immediately on the Kantian

solution, rejected what did not appeal to them, and carried off what seemed adapted to their own particular needs; so that since Kant's day nearly all philosophy has been more or less a reflex of Kant's central thought. Kant took the opposite extreme from that of Berkeley—and even from that of Des Cartes. He set up the empirical reality as the *summum verum*, utterly regardless of the fact that it was precisely upon this empirical reality that the *Dubito, ergo sum* had cast such grave suspicion. Kant himself fully understood the nature of the problem which he attempted to solve. He fully realized that, in the face of the Cartesian doubt, what men called the empirical reality must have other voucher besides the testimony of the senses. That the impassable chasm which separates consciousness from the external world must be bridged over in some way, before the Cartesian demands are fully satisfied or its doubts set at rest, Kant comprehended at least in a hazy sort of fashion. Nay, even that the testimony of the senses must be properly authenticated before they can be accepted as the final word of human knowledge, he understood, in his lucid intervals of reason, at least. But his perception of this was only intermittent. He dimly perceived that if we are to have knowledge at all of an external world the testimony of consciousness must in some way be linked to the testimony of the senses. But he met the Cartesian problem—as he met all other problems—in crab fashion and indirectly; and he undertook to get across the abyss that divides consciousness from the empirical reality, not by bridging it, but by filling it in—and filling it in with emptiness. Realizing that if our empirical knowledge is to be worth anything it must have other validation than that of the senses, he attempted to fill in the bottomless abyss. And with what? The categories! This feat of metaphysical engineering might well have originated in bedlam. He took the categories of Aristotle and by an extraordinary process of sublimation—at best a mere metaphysical hypothesis—transformed them into forms of the mind or moulds in the understanding prepared there for experience; and these, as so many piles, he attempted to drive into the bottomless gulf. But if the categories are mere forms of the mind—and, consequently, instead of sinking into the abyss, still remain in the mind—how are they going to fill in the abyss or bridge over the yawning chasm? The original problem was: how to pass over from the mind—consciousness—to the external reality? How, then, can the categories advance us a single step if they are merely forms of the mind? Does the mind project them from itself? Are they immaterial antennæ which the mind extends at will and which reach out until they grasp the external not-me and then clasp it in an everlasting

embrace? Are they the drawbridge that is to be let down at will, that stretches across the moat and connects the castle of consciousness with the mainland of the empirical? Possibly. But this fantastic theory is nothing more than mere fancy, and men of thought will require more than Kant's mere word for it. The fact is that men have been so utterly bewildered by the Cartesian challenge regarding the value of all empirical knowledge that they have eagerly grasped at any theory that held out a hope of solution or possessed any semblance of cohesion; and Kant's theory of the categories was the only theory at all on the subject.

All the fourth-rate intellects followed the leadership of Kant; and Kant's solution of the problem being the only one offered to it, the agnostic world has ever since lorded it majestically over the rest of creation, boasting of its intellectual precedence over the rest of mankind, without having even the faintest suspicion as to what was the real nature of the problem which Kant pretended he had solved. Kant made empirical truth the only kind of truth; and to minds which had never grasped the deeper problems of philosophic thought, Kant's standard of truth instantly appealed. To ignorance there could, of course, be no stronger evidence than the evidence of the senses; and when Kant raised the standard of empiricism, the only reality, ignorance seized upon it as a perfectly self-evident proposition. Kant himself, of course, fully comprehended that empirical truth, if it was to withstand the attacks of the skeptics, must have an entirely different warranty from that furnished by the senses. He confessed candidly that to furnish this warranty was by far the most difficult part of his task. It "has," he says, "given me the greatest trouble." But his followers take the problem most jauntily and are perfectly satisfied to accept all empirical knowledge on its own recognizances.

Thus it is that for more than a century Kant's theory of the categories has been a deadly upas tree in the fair garden of philosophy, stifling all healthy inquiry, and leaving the entire field a mere wilderness of sickly, withered, and dead thought. Errors in philosophy are far more injurious to the body politic than even errors in religion. The fact is that, although philosophy is caviare to the general, a sound philosophy is absolutely essential to all healthy thought and right views of life. It is the little leaven **that leaveneth the whole mass**. If it be pure it will purify all our views of life. This is why Plato and Aristotle rose to such lofty heights of learning—even in spiritual things—without any light from religion. Their light is the only glimmer of truth that comes to us through all the pagan darkness. Quite unobtrusively, sound philosophy lies at the root of all thought, and if the fountain-

head be pure, so also will be the stream which flows from it. The air we breathe is not more unobtrusive; but neither is it more essential than a pure philosophy to life and conduct; and a foul or pestilential atmosphere is not more deathbearing to the human frame than is a false philosophy to the well-being of humanity. Sound philosophy is as essential to a healthy social, political and moral body and to sound and wholesome views of life, as is the blood that courses unseen through the veins, to the glow of health upon the cheek or to the strength of muscle in the limb. Our science, our sociology, our political life, our views of government, but, above all, our ethics are in the last analysis based on the philosophy which we adopt; for philosophy lies at the very basis of thought and goes to the very root of conduct and action. Hence the irreparable injury which Kant's false metaphysic has inflicted on the world. His philosophy has lain like a nightmare over all thought for the last century and a quarter, and with its false principles and halting knowledge has sent the world on a wrong tack. Hence Socialism in its worst form, anarchy, wild theories of government and society are broached, and preached, and philosophized about, and adopted—all, the logical outcome of Kant's speculations. The lone and lonely philosopher may stand on the lofty heights of pure speculation, lifted far above the multitude; but if his thought touches the fundamentals of practical life it will not be many months before the multitudes in the valley below will have incorporated in their own lives and actions the thought which he spoke at first only to the stars, and his philosophy will soon be shaping the conduct of life for millions of men as well as their destiny for the nations. We have only to look around us for ample proof of all this. Thousands who have never heard of a syllogism are acting from a false one. Millions of men who would be wholly incapable of grasping the meaning of a sophism are the victims of numberless fallacies, and their lives, conduct and policy are shaped by the influence of sophisms which they accept as sound principles of reason. Professor De Wulf is right when, in his recent excellent work, he tells us that: "From the calm heights of pure speculation, which are familiar to the philosopher alone, Kant's teachings and theories have also found way into the prefaces of scientific works and into avowedly popularizing treatises; nay, they have even percolated into our modern dramas and romances." So far is Professor De Wulf is right. But we cannot agree with him when he tells us: "We believe that the explanation of the enormous influence of Kantism lies in its remarkable combination of a theoretical subjectivism with a practical dogmatism. The phenomenism which is the last word of the

'Critique of Pure Reason' . . . would never have caught on (!) without the noumenism of the 'Critique of Practical Reason.' Kant's ethics serve as a palliative after his criteriology, for they establish on the basis of sentiment and will the existence of God and of the soul, as well as human liberty and immortality; all of which realities or things-in-themselves the intelligence of man is unable to discover, and which are, nevertheless, the indispensable nourishment of moral and social life. Hence we see it was mainly on the ground of his ethical teaching that the return movement towards Kant was accomplished." With this explanation of the "Zurück zu Kant" we cannot agree. We think men accept what they regard as his inevitable and inexorable conclusions of reason, because in his "Critique of Pure Reason" Kant shrouds his sophisms in such mists of obscurity, that they regard his pronouncements as the thunders of another Sinai, and believe that his quibbling antinomies must be accepted as the iron logic of speculative inquiry from which there is no escape. Men adopt his conclusions because they see no way of refuting his preposterous arguments. They accept his criteriology, which tells them that the objective reality of all that forms the basis of revealed religion is illusory, in the face of pure reason; but they accept all this because they imagine the logic of the categories to be invulnerable; and then, by way of compensation, they atone to themselves for the self-inflicted wrong by accepting without question the logic of the "Critique of Practical Reason"—simply because it restores to them fraudulently what has been fraudulently snatched from them in the realm of speculative reason. But it is from the speculative region—not from the practical—that the doctrines of Kant have filtered down into the walks of practical life. At bottom there can be no difference between speculative and practical truth. One of the hallucinations with which Kant deluded his followers is that a thing may be speculatively false yet practically true. It is one of his famous juggleries. But the practical is always based on the speculative in philosophy; and if the speculative principle be false, the practical application of it cannot be true. We have not hitherto even hinted at the fact that Kant tried in his "Critique of Practical Reason" to make amends for the injustice of the logical *betises* in the "Critique of Pure Reason," for the reason that we have not deemed the "Critique of Practical Reason" as worthy of even a passing notice. As if a conclusion from the emotions and the will could be of any value where the logic of pure reason was magisterially rejected! No; the argument from voluntarism cannot for a moment be regarded as of greater value than the argument from pure logic; and there is no consideration which causes the

gorge to rise so quickly against Kant, or which is so well calculated to cause the mind to revolt against his wanton attempts at dogmatism, as the reflection that he has labored so strenuously to wrest from us the conclusions of reason which are imperative and incontrovertible, and in their stead to force the world to accept the halting conclusions (because of halting premises) from the will alone. The fact is that Kant, like all dictators, assailed in the strongest possible terms what he called the old rotten dogmatism in metaphysic; that this was done merely for the purpose of setting up in its stead his own irrational and stupid dogmatism, and that this was done, too, in the most tyrannical way—under cover of the obscurity of the subject and the abstruseness of the argument by which he pretended to have established his theory. The defense was, however, worse than the original offense. Men might have well known that truth never fears the open day; that it is only error and falsehood that court obscurity; that the man who has an honest thought or an honest argument will never be at a loss for language in which to express it with sufficient clearness so that the world will be able to understand it; that the moment Kant pleaded the obscurity of his subject as his pretext for his want of clearness, he had thereby given the very strongest evidence of bad faith; and that when, like the spiritualistic medium, he invoked the clouds of darkness instead of the clearness of the noonday sun, under cover of which to unfold his deduction of the categories, he only invited in their behalf the very strongest kind of suspicion. It is this obscurity which we shall now endeavor to uncover.

In our last article we saw the meaning of the categories in the Kantian sense of the term, how important and fundamental a place they hold in the entire Kantian system, and how the discovery so-called made by Kant that the categories are not objective, but subjective (that is, that they are forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought to which all experience must conform), was the great Copernican achievement which has revolutionized so completely all philosophy since his day. We have also seen that Kant imagined that, by means of the categories, he had discredited forever the proofs for the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, etc.; that he claimed that, since all knowledge must come from experience and hence be empirical, since all experience and consequently all empirical knowledge can come only through the categories, whose form it must necessarily assume, and since the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, etc., can never come into experience, these truths can, therefore, never become empirical knowledge, and thus can

never become knowledge properly so-called. And we have also seen that, in view of all this, Kant, therefore, imagined that he had said the last word on the question of the knowledge of the great metaphysical problems, and that Kant's agnostic followers have, ever since his day, regarded the case of these problems as closed for all time. But, on the other hand, we have also seen that Kant did not go to the bottom of the question at all, that while claiming that all our knowledge must be empirical knowledge, he made all our empirical knowledge rest at the same time on knowledge that is not and never can be empirical; namely, on the categories; so that instead of establishing empirical knowledge as the only kind of knowledge he did empirical knowledge the very worst kind of service, and even damaged it completely. He claimed two things utterly incompatible with each other. He maintained that all our knowledge must be empirical knowledge, and yet he insisted that all this empirical knowledge must rest on and derive its sanction from knowledge that is *a priori*, namely, the categories, which are not and never can be empirical. In other words, Kant makes the categories vouch for the truth of our empirical knowledge. But who can vouch for the truth of the categories in the Kantian sense; that is, who can show that the categories belong to the mind only, and that they have existence within us at all as forms of the understanding? Yet, according to Kant, it is on the truth of this hypothesis that the truth of all our empirical knowledge rests. Thus, as we have seen, Kant is hoist with his own petard. There is no escape for the devout Kantian from this dilemma.

Possibly, however, some of Kant's followers might, without grasping the problem that is here to be solved, undertake to maintain that empirical knowledge needs no voucher of any kind, that the truth of our sense-experience carries with it its own proof. But to make such an assertion would be to show that the person advancing it had no conception of the real problem at issue, and that he had never heard not only of the serious issues raised by Berkeley, but also of the grave problems raised by Des Cartes—which have sent all philosophy since his day into an entirely new groove. Kant himself, however, fully realized that his empirical knowledge must have proper authentication, and that this authentication must come from Des Cartes' sole established truth—the truth of the thinking subject; and Kant's entire endeavor was to connect the empirical reality with the thinking consciousness. It was for this purpose he established his categories; and it is on the truth of those categories—as he supposed them—he rested the truth of all our empirical knowledge. Incidentally we see, therefore, that the

great difficulty with Kantians is that of following Kant and grasping their master's philosophy as a whole. Be that as it may, Kant has left little room for doubt that he saw that the empirical reality must have proper sanction; that is, that, in the face of the Cartesian problem, it must rest on other knowledge before, from a philosophical point of view, it can be admitted as knowledge at all; and his whole difficulty lies in giving it this sanction. In order to have a proper basis on which to establish the truth of our empirical knowledge he has been forced to maintain that we have an *a priori* knowledge which is independent of and antecedent to the empirical, and that on this, as on a foundation, all our empirical knowledge, that is, the truth of all our experience, rests. This *a priori* knowledge on which all empirical knowledge rests is the categories. His argument is—indeed, it is one of the leading principles of his philosophy—that we actually have cognitions *a priori*. These cognitions *a priori* are the categories. He tells us:

“But though all our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it arises from experience. For it is quite possible that even our empirical experience (*sic*) is a compound of that which we receive through impressions, and of that which our own faculty of knowledge (incited only by sensuous impressions) supplies from itself, a supplement which we do not distinguish from that raw material until long practice has roused our attention and rendered us capable of separating one from the other.”

Kant here gently introduces the question: whether there be a knowledge besides that of experience, and quietly suggests that there really may enter into experience an element “which our own faculty of knowledge supplies from itself.” He immediately pursues the question and says:

“It is, therefore, a question which deserves at least closer investigation, and cannot be disposed of at first sight, whether there exists a knowledge independent of experience, and even of all impressions of the senses?”

This broaches the subject fully and directly; and, without even waiting to answer his own question, he at once takes it for granted that it can be answered only in the affirmative, and immediately proceeds to give this knowledge, which is “independent of experience, and even of all impressions of the sense,” a name, and to distinguish properly between it and empirical knowledge. He adds:

“Such *knowledge* is called *a priori*, and distinguished from *empirical* knowledge, which has its sources *a posteriori*, that is, in experience.”

The italics here and in what follows are Kant's own. He proceeds to distinguish further and further classify this knowledge.

He tells us that "This term *a priori*, however, is not yet definite enough to indicate the full meaning of our question;" and after showing how "this term is not yet definite enough" to suit him, he adds:

"We shall, therefore, in what follows understand by knowledge *a priori* knowledge which is *absolutely* independent of all experience and not of this or that experience only. Opposed to this is empirical knowledge, or such as is possible *a posteriori* only, that is, by experience."

This *a priori* knowledge, then, is absolutely independent of all experience, and Kant places it in contradistinction to empirical knowledge. It is quite evident, then, that in spite of all Kant's attempts to exclude from knowledge the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, because they can never be met with in experience and consequently can never become empirical, he has, inconsistently enough, laid down as one of his leading principles that there is a knowledge which is not empirical and which is prior to and independent of all experience, and that he has gone even further and made this knowledge the basis on which all empirical knowledge rests. It is not a little strange, too, that this glaring contradiction in his very fundamentals seems hitherto to have been passed over unnoticed by the critics. This is especially strange, since this contradiction of itself overturns Kant's entire system of philosophy, like a house of cards. Kant, however, leaves no room for doubt on this point. He lays down the proposition that:

"We are in possession of certain cognitions *a priori*, and even the ordinary understanding is never without them."

And he proceeds to prove the truth of this proposition. He says:

"All depends here on a criterion, by which we may safely distinguish between pure and empirical knowledge."

These criteria he finds to be necessity and universality. He assures us: "Necessity, therefore, and strict universality are safe criteria of knowledge *a priori*, and are inseparable one from the other."

And he concludes by answering his question in this wise:

"That there really exist in our knowledge such necessary, and in the strictest sense universal, and therefore pure judgments *a priori*, is easy to show. If we want a scientific example, we have only to look to any of the propositions of mathematics; if we want one from the ordinary sphere of the understanding, such a proposition as that each change must have a cause will answer the purpose."

We are not interested here in pointing out Kant's glaring contradiction between this latter statement and that which we have

just quoted above—glaring contradictions in his statements did not annoy Kant very greatly—we are simply showing here that Kant found it essentially necessary to base all our empirical knowledge on knowledge that is not empirical; and that by this *a priori* knowledge he meant real knowledge. And this he tells us plainly in his conclusion—so clearly worded that no one can mistake its meaning.

“It is possible even, without having recourse to such examples in proof of the *reality* (italics ours) of pure propositions *a priori* within our knowledge, to prove their indispensability for the possibility of experience itself, thus proving it *a priori*. For whence should experience take its certainty if all the rules which it follows were always again and again empirical, and therefore contingent and hardly fit to serve as first principles?”

How, in the face of this elaborated proof and clear statement that all our empirical knowledge must rest on knowledge that is not and never can be empirical, Kant could have the consummate effrontery to presume to exclude from knowledge the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the will, solely on the ground that knowledge of these can never become empirical is utterly incomprehensible; and that, at the same time this should be the end and object of his whole work in the “Critique of Pure Reason” is to us one of the greatest curiosities in philosophy, in literature, or indeed in the history of the human mind. And this curious phenomenon is paralleled by another equally strange, viz., that men should call all this effrontery a great revolution in human thought and one of the splendid advances of the human intellect! What wonder that Kant’s critics, bewildered by his sophistries and dumbstricken by his amazing conclusions, should run about in every direction and busy themselves with merely secondary and subsidiary questions, such as noumena and phenomena, and overlook completely the great fundamental problem and the great fundamental fallacy! We surmise, however, that the failure of the critics has been due to two distinct yet allied causes arising from the obscurities in which Kant has wrapped his gigantic fallacies, viz., failure to grasp Kant’s purpose as a whole and failure to grasp his sophistical argument as one organic whole.

Kant believed, too, that “Not only in judgments, but even in certain concepts, can we show their origin *a priori*.” Now, these concepts are the Kantian categories. Kant tells us: “Among the many concepts, however, which enter into the complicated code of human knowledge, there are some which are destined for pure use *a priori*.” He says:

“The conditions *a priori* of any possible experience in general are at the same time conditions of the possibility of any objects-

of our experience. Now, I maintain that the categories of which we are speaking are nothing but the conditions of thought in any possible experience, as much as space and time contain the conditions of the intuitions which form experience. These categories, therefore, are fundamental concepts by which we think objects of all phenomena in general, and have therefore *a priori* objective validity."

Hence the categories of Kant are the *a priori* knowledge on which all our empirical knowledge is founded and without which we could, according to Kant, have no knowledge at all. That is, the *a priori* knowledge of the categories properly authenticates our empirical knowledge. The question consequently arises naturally and legitimately: Who is going to authenticate this *a priori* knowledge of the categories? It is perfectly plain that unless this knowledge is furnished with the proper credentials we can have no knowledge of any kind whatever, and that the very first duty of Kant was to show the validity of our knowledge of the categories. As we have seen in a former article, Kant's categories differ from those of all other philosophers who preceded him, in the fact that they are derived neither from the object nor from experience, but are supposed to be forms of the understanding itself—mental moulds of knowledge into which experience is poured and whose forms all experience, and consequently all our empirical knowledge, must assume. Consequently the primary duty that devolved on Kant was to show that, as forms of the understanding or moulds of the mind for the reception of experience, they have an actual existence in the mind; in other words, that these categories of his possess objective reality. This Kant seems to have understood fully, and he also seems to have set about it—in some sort of fashion at least; for again and again he attempts to show that his categories, as such, have objective reality. Kant has made such desperate efforts to show that his categories possess objective validity that it is a perfectly legitimate and even interesting inquiry to ask to what extent has he succeeded. If he has failed in these efforts, his preposterous claims in behalf of the sole sovereignty of empirical knowledge become discredited by another and equally conclusive title, and the adventitious semblance of solidity with which he attempted to invest these claims is left without foundation of any kind. We shall endeavor, then, to follow Kant in his proofs of the objective reality of the Kantian categories. In order, however, to begin at the beginning and to clear the question of all confusion, the question must first be asked and answered: What is meant by the objective validity of Kant's categories? This question is of supreme importance, because Kant, with his usual facility in

juggling, has so confused the matter that, as we have seen in the case of his transcendental idealism, he has made the objective validity of the categories mean the exact opposite of what it really means.

It is quite evident that when Kant performed his Copernican feat of transferring the categories from the object or from experience to the mind itself and made them forms of the mind or moulds of the understanding into which experience was to be poured and whose forms experience must necessarily take, before he could make a single step in his new science of metaphysic, it was absolutely necessary that he show clearly that his hypothesis was the correct one, and that the categories, instead of belonging wholly or in part to the object, belonged wholly to the subject and had actual existence as forms of the understanding or mental moulds of knowledge. If all our knowledge, as Kant claimed, must conform to these categories; if nothing can be known except through them; if they even impose their laws on the physical world—as Kant assures us they do—they must be real and actual and not merely imaginary forms of the mind. In other words, they must have a real existence in the mind, and consequently must have an objective validity there. Without this all Kant's conclusions from them were nothing but air castles. This, then, and this only, can be meant when we speak of the objective reality or validity of the Kantian categories; viz., that they have a real existence in the mind—as real as the mind itself—and this, independent of all experience. It is evident, too, that this cannot mean that they exist only when called into action in experience; for this would be equal to saying that they depended on experience for their existence; and Kant's crowning characteristic of his categories is that they are "prior to and independent of all experience," and that they "lie prepared in the mind," awaiting experience. This is a point which we must not lose sight of; for never once does Kant speak of the objective validity of his categories in this sense at all; and, whether with or without design (with deliberate design, we believe), he has led his followers along a false track, which can never bring them to a demonstration of the real existence of his categories, as forms of the mind. It is particularly noteworthy that Kant never faces the question of the objective validity of his categories directly, but always approaches it in crab fashion. Indeed, in the long history of fraud and imposture we know of nothing that can compare with the bold assurance of Kant that he had reached this the pole-star of his philosophical system, if it be not the claim of Dr. Cook that he had reached the full discovery of the North Pole. Instead of manfully facing the task of proving that his categories are wholly subjective, Kant proceeded to raise

a gigantic dust storm to be blown in the faces of those who might have the hardihood to ask for such proof. With his extraordinary capacity for juggling he makes a pretense of satisfying this need for proof without explicitly admitting its necessity; and instead of facing the pressing problem and proving that his categories possessed objective validity, he gave his followers what he pompously styled a "Transcendental Deduction of the Categories." This might have been all very well if, under cover of his high-sounding title, he had proved that his categories had a real existence as forms of the mind, and therefore objective validity; but this seems to have been farthest from Kant's thought; and what he attempted to show, under cover of his sounding phrase, was not the objective validity of his categories at all, but "the manner," as he himself styles it, "how such concepts (the categories) can *a priori* refer to objects." Had Kant stopped even here, the outrage on human reason might have been borne, but he had the even still more audacious effrontery to assure his followers that in attempting to show them "how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects" he was proving to them the objective validity of his categories. And—what is well calculated to shatter all faith in the powers of human reason—Kant found men who believed him! But lest we might be accused of traducing Kant, we shall quote his own words. After assuring his disciples that a deduction of the categories—and this a transcendental one—was necessary, he explains what he means by this transcendental deduction:

"I call the explanation of the manner how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects their transcendental deduction, and distinguish it from the empirical deduction which shows the manner how a concept may be gained by experience and by reflection on experience; this does not touch the legitimacy, but only the fact whence the possession of the concept arose."

Kant here informs us that the transcendental deduction of his categories is merely "the explanation of the manner how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects." But, as has been said, this is not what the requirements of the case called for from Kant at all. What was needed—what is still needed—what will ever be needed—and, what never has been given by Kant or any of his disciples—is the proof that his categories belong exclusively to the subject; that they have a real existence as forms in the understanding; that this view is the correct one instead of that of Aristotle, or that of Locke or Hume. That was the crying need; but it is manifest that Kant's intention was to evade rather than satisfy it, and to confuse rather than clear up the issue. What

Kant attempts to do—instead of proving that his categories have a real existence as forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought—is to show “how these concepts can refer to objects.” Had he rested satisfied with this no one would have greatly complained. It would be manifest that he declined to furnish proof and wanted to be regarded as a dictator whose mere *ipse dixit* sufficed. But in order to give his transcendental deduction of the categories an appearance of having proved his theory, he adds: “This does not touch the legitimacy, but only the fact whence the possession of the concept arose.” Now, it is precisely “the fact whence the possession of the concept arose,” that is, called for; and showing that “the concepts refer to objects” is by no means showing “the fact whence the possession of the concepts arose.” Aristotle held that “the fact from which the possession of the concept (or category) arose” was the object itself. Locke believed that “the fact from which the possession of the concept arose” was experience and reflection on experience, while Kant maintains that “the fact from which the possession of the concept arose” is a form in the understanding itself. Consequently, to show how these concepts can refer to objects is by no means to show which of these three theories—Kant’s theory, or Locke’s theory, or Aristotle’s theory—is the correct one; or whether any of all three is correct. It certainly cannot, by any force of violent wrenching or straining, be made to do duty for proof of the objective validity of the categories in Kant’s sense of the term; and this is what the requirements of the case demand. But Kant evidently wanted to confuse matters and to raise a blinding dust in order to persuade his followers that he had shown the objective validity of his categories when he had merely shown what no one had ever doubted or questioned for a moment. The juggler must keep two balls in the air when he wishes to impose on his audience, and Kant, like him, must raise a double issue and confound two essentially different features—the original source of the categories or their objective validity, and their relation to objects. But these two differ *toto calo* from each other, and to prove—even had Kant proved it—that they “refer to objects” is by no means to prove the objective validity of his categories. The fact is that Kant seems to have been fully aware of the hopelessness of the task which he had set himself and which his system of philosophy demanded, viz., that of proving that his categories are forms of the mind, and that as such they have objective validity; consequently, he resorted to all sorts of expedients to cover up the absence of proof. The moment Kant is confronted with the problem of proving the truth of *his* categories he at once becomes confused and even

desperate. He stops at no chicanery. He shrinks from no trickery. He is on every side of the same question, and does not hesitate to use for argument the very principles he is rejecting. Even prevarication has no difficulty for him, and he does not scruple to impress falsehood and deceit into his thesis, as it stands in need of them. We have already quoted instances of this in our first article, and we shall repeat some of them here; for it is here they especially apply.

In the very preface to the first edition of his famous work he confesses that the "Deduction of the Pure Concepts of the Understanding (that is, the categories) have given me the greatest trouble;" and we can well believe it. Again in the body of the work itself he tells us:

"The deduction of the categories is beset with so many difficulties and obliges us to enter so deeply into the first grounds of the possibility of our knowledge in general, that I thought it more expedient, in order to avoid the lengthiness of a complete theory, and yet to omit nothing in so essential an investigation, to add the following four paragraphs with a view of preparing rather than instructing the reader. After that only I shall in the third section proceed to a systematical discussion of these elements of the understanding. Till then the reader must not allow himself to be frightened by a certain amount of obscurity which at first is inevitable on a road never trodden before, but which, when we come to that section, will give way, I hope, to a complete comprehension."

We do not quite understand what Kant means by "preparing rather than instructing the reader" in this quotation, but judging from the context we imagine it means a species of metaphysical third degree, after which the victim will gladly cry "Amen" to any conclusion whatever. Instruction or enlightenment, as Kant has well said, there is not. Nevertheless, we believe that if a man has any truth to teach—even in metaphysic—he can make himself understood, and there is no need of an appeal to obscurity.

Previously he had told us:

"Before the reader has made a single step in the field of pure reason, he must be convinced of the necessity of such a transcendental deduction, otherwise he would walk on blindly, and, after having strayed in every direction, he would return only to the same ignorance from which he started. He must at the same time perceive the inevitable difficulty of such a deduction, so that he may not complain about obscurity where the object itself is obscure, or weary too soon with a removal of obstacles."

It is Kant himself, however, that has been "straying in every direction," and who, we are sorry to say, has strayed even from

the path of strict truth. So great was his difficulty and so profound the obscurity of the region in which he found himself that the lie logical—or the fallacy—did not prove equal to the requirements, and Kant found it necessary to have recourse to the lie categorical—or the falsehood. We have already noticed in our first article the Kantian fable regarding the definitions of the categories; but it should not be omitted here. If Kant was going to give us a transcendental or other deduction of these categories; if he was going to explain their meaning and origin; if they are central and pivotal in all philosophy and all knowledge; if such momentous issues hung upon a proper understanding of them; obviously, the very first duty of the philosopher who raised them to so high a rank and endowed them with such transcendental importance was to give an intelligible definition of each one of them. If the categories were to be the chief corner-stone of a new metaphysical edifice which was to supersede all previous structures; if they were to revolutionize all our knowledge as completely as the Copernican theory revolutionized our astronomy, men should be able to understand what was the nature of the new agency which was to supplant the old and seal up forever, as useless and misleading, those volumes of knowledge which the world had hitherto regarded as its most precious treasures. There should be no mystery about the nature of the magic instrument which was to accomplish such wonders. The categories were to supersede all knowledge of the existence of God, the freedom of the will and the immortality of the soul; and men were asked to barter not only their faith and supernatural knowledge regarding these things, but also all that reason itself, with all the emphasis of an apodictic certainty, had taught them on the subject—and all this for their faith in the Kantian category. It was, therefore, a primary duty that the chief promoter and author of the new knowledge should give the world some account of the nature of the instruments for which they were to exchange all their long-cherished, fundamental truths. Manifestly the categories should be properly defined; and manifestly Kant fully realized his obligatory duty in this regard. But in the whole history of philosophy there is nothing that can compare in infamy with the following combination of statements. In the first and second editions of the "Critique of Pure Reason" the following apparently frank statement appears:

"I intentionally omit here the definition of these categories, though I may be in possession of them. In the sequel I shall dissect these concepts so far as is sufficient for the purpose of the method which I am preparing. In a complete system of pure

reason they might justly be demanded, but at present they would make us lose sight of the principal object of our investigation by rousing doubts and suspicions which, without injury to our essential object, may well be relegated to another time. The little I have said ought to be sufficient to show clearly that a complete dictionary of these concepts with all requisite explanations is not only possible, but easy."

This seeming candor and promise for the future would be all very well in its way had it only been fulfilled; but when that "another time" comes to which these definitions had "been relegated," Kant has an entirely different story to tell—a story so damning that he suppresses it wholly in the second edition (and consequently in subsequent editions). It is:

"When representing the table of the categories we dispensed with the definition of every one of them, because at that time it seemed unnecessary for our purpose, which concerned their synthetic use only, and because entailing responsibilities which we were not bound to incur (?). This was not a mere excuse, but a very important prudential rule, viz., not to rush into definitions and to attempt completeness or precision in the definition of a concept, when one or other of its characteristic marks is sufficient, without a complete enumeration of all that constitute the whole concept."

Compared with the preceding statement, this shows to what shifts and depths of deceit Kant could descend, when it suited his purpose; but more follows. He immediately adds:

"Now, however, we can perceive that this caution had even a deeper ground, namely, that we could not have defined them even if we had wished; for if we remove all conditions of sensibility, which distinguish them as the concepts of a possible empirical use, and treat them as concepts of things in general (therefore as of transcendental use), nothing remains but to regard the logical function in judgments as the conditions of the possibility of the things themselves, without the slightest indication as to where they could have their application and their object, or how they could have any meaning or objective validity in the pure understanding, apart from sensibility."

This shows to what desperate straits Kant was reduced and how clearly he perceived that the only way in which he could get his new Copernican theory of the categories imposed on the world was by resorting to deceit, and then hiding his failure under cover of the abstruse nature of his problem. There is, however, just one way to unmask Kant, and that is to follow him into the depths of the darkness and obscurity which he voluntarily courted

and expose even there the fraud and trickery to which he has confessedly resorted. Let us pursue him even still further into this "obscurity" on a road never before trodden and uncover his methods still further.

We have seen that the primary duty that devolved on Kant was to prove the objective validity of his categories; that is, that they have a real existence as forms of the understanding. We have also seen how Kant has tried to make his transcendental deduction of these categories pass muster—in the darkness—for proof of their objective validity. But the further we follow him the more evident does it become that Kant, haunted by the impossibility of his task of proving the objective reality of his categories, grasps, like a drowning man, at any straw, and is ready to call anything and everything "proof" of the "objective validity of" his categories. Nay, when he emerges finally from the depths of obscurity which he so courted, with the transcendental deduction waving proudly in the air as the trophy of his victory, we find that he has not given us either a transcendental deduction, nor a metaphysical deduction, nor an empirical deduction, nor a deduction of any kind whatsoever; but that, like all men traveling in the darkness, he has ricocheted around and around in a circle, and ended precisely where he began—by showing that there is a "relation" between the categories and the objects of experience. The full value of this momentous discovery can be appreciated when we say that the fact of such a "relation" has never been questioned by any one; that it is the fact of this "relation" which centuries ago sent Aristotle in search of the different categories, and set him to inquire how many of these categories he could find in this "relation;" that how these categories arise, what is their origin—since they ever enter into all our knowledge—whether they are to be attributed to the subject or to the object, or to both, or whether they are mere abstractions from experience, are the questions which have arisen from this evident "relation," and that have even sent Kant himself in search of the *origin* of these categories and the *manner* of their "relation to objects of experience." This relation of the categories to the objects of experience had ever been regarded by philosophers so manifest that there was no denying it. It was unquestionable, unmistakable, obtrusive and aggressive; it would not down. And now Kant tells us that he has proved there exists such a relation, and that in proving this he has proved the objective validity of his categories! This may seem incredible to those who have not taken the pains to understand Kant; but his own words can hardly be gainsaid when he tells us the conclusion of his investigations:

"This, and no more than this, we were called upon to prove in the transcendental deduction of the categories, namely, to make the relation of the understanding to our sensibility, and through it to all objects of experience, that is the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding, conceivable *a priori*, and thus establish their origin and truth."

Doubtless this extraordinary sentence—extraordinary in every way—will need translation into English before the ordinary reader can grasp its full meaning. In plain language it means—when properly analyzed—(1) that the transcendental deduction of the categories—which, Kant says, "gave him the greatest trouble"—consists in making the relation of the understanding to all objects of experience, conceivable *a priori*. (2) It further tells us that this relation is effected by means of our sensibility, which is the connecting link between our understanding and the objects of experience. (3) It tells us that by the objective validity of the categories is meant this relation of the understanding to all objects of experience by means of our sensibility. (4) It further tells us that the making of this relation of the understanding to all objects of experience, conceivable *a priori*, actually proves the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding; that is, of the categories; and (5) deponent further saith that this entire process; videlicet, the making of this relation of the understanding to the objects of experience—by means of our sensibility—conceivable *a priori*, actually establishes the origin and truth of the categories themselves.

Now, this is Kant's conclusion after passing through the troublous region. And thus he proves the transcendental deduction of the categories! And thus he proves the objective validity of the Kantian categories as actually existing forms of the understanding! And this is the great treasure which he has left to posterity! But (1) that there exists a relation between the understanding and the objects of experience is a proposition which no man in his senses ever undertook to question. That this relation extends to all objects of experience no one ever questioned or ever will. That this relation is conceivable *a priori* and *a posteriori* no one whose mind was not completely muddled by perplexity of some kind would have even broached; for this relation is not only conceivable both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, but is actual and real, and no man may undertake to gainsay it. (2) That this relation between the understanding and the objects of experience is effected by means of our sensibility, which is the connecting link between them, may pass without challenge; although other philosophers would express it in more logical form. But (3) that this relation

between the understanding and all the objects of experience—even when effected by means of our sensibility—that this should be made to pass muster for a definition of the objective validity of the Kantian category, or that the two notions are at all interchangeable, is one of those reckless assertions which Kant was wont to make when he found himself “beset with difficulties.” The objective validity of the Kantian categories means—and it can mean nothing else—that these categories have a real existence in the mind as forms of the understanding. This is what distinguishes them from the categories of Aristotle as well as those of Locke; and the proof of the objective validity of the Kantian categories must consist in showing that they have a real existence in the mind as forms of the understanding. In no other way can Kant or any one else prove their objective validity. Hence (4) when Kant has the effrontery to assert that, when he has made it conceivable *a priori* that between the understanding and all the objects of experience there exists a relation which is effected by our sensibility, he has thereby proved the objective validity of his categories, he is taking advantage of the obscurity of his problem to foist upon the world wild, reckless and false statements. How the simple fact that the relation of the understanding to the objects of experience becomes conceivable *a priori* can prove that Kant’s categories really exist in the mind as forms of the understanding, is one of those wild, random, reckless statements that surpass all human understanding. (5) That to make conceivable *a priori* the existence of a relation between the understanding and the objects of experience—even when this relation is effected by means of our sensibility—could “establish the truth” of the Kantian categories, any more than it can “establish the origin and truth” of the categories in the Lockian sense or in the Aristotelian sense, is so plainly absurd that we need not dwell upon it here. All that it can possibly mean is that our minds have a capacity for knowledge of external objects..

The fact seems to be that Kant became so completely bewildered and confused when he entered upon the proof of his Copernican hypothesis that he lost sight of his bearings completely; although he never seems to have lost his audacious effrontery. He clearly enough perceived what the requirements of his newly assumed position demanded; and he seems to have fully realized the utter impossibility of fulfilling these requirements; but he also seemed determined to brazen it out boldly to the end, in the hope that, in the darkness and obscurity, his reckless statements might pass for sound reasoning.

Our space forbids us to go into the extraordinary arguments

on which he bases his extraordinary conclusions that the *a priori* possibility of the categories is a proof of their real existence as forms of the mind. But we may gather Kant's own real opinion of the conclusiveness of his arguments from a few facts. In the first edition of his famous work he devotes thirty pages to the deduction of the categories, and at their close he tells us: "On this ground, as the only possible one, our deduction of the categories has been carried out." Nevertheless, in spite of this emphatic statement, when he comes to prepare a second edition, this "only possible ground on which our deduction of the categories" can be "carried out," is completely abandoned; or, as Max Muller puts it: "In the second edition . . . the Deduction of the Categories is much changed." This is not the only evidence, however, that Kant had little faith in his own logic, and that throughout the deduction of the categories he was merely playing a game of bluff or blind man's buff. He talks very courageously and confidently about the success of his new Copernican discovery; but it is only too evident that at heart he has only the gravest kind of misgiving regarding the real success of his wonderful achievement. As he gropes his way at haphazard through the obscurity of "the never-before-trodden paths" he keeps up a brave whistling; but this is evidently for the purpose of keeping up his own courage. It is amusing to place in juxtaposition his magisterial dogmatism and his trembling hesitancy, his extravagant assurances that his conclusions are nothing short of apodictic, and the tell-tale expressions which betray his mistrust that everything was not exactly right. Our space will permit us to glance merely at a few. In his preface to the first edition he tells us with the most serene confidence:

"I flatter myself that I have thus removed all those errors which have hitherto brought reason into conflict with itself. I have not evaded its questions by pleading the insufficiency of human reason, but I have classified them according to principles, and, after showing the point where reason begins to understand itself, solved them satisfactorily."

Here at least Kant seems to have been satisfied with the result of his labors; and, in the first flush of imaginary success, he goes still further.

"In this work," he adds, "I have chiefly aimed at completeness, and I venture to maintain that there ought not to be one single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or to the solution of which the key at least has not been supplied."

In his overweening confidence he becomes even rash in his statements. He tells us that "two essential demands—certainty and clearness—may very properly be addressed to an author who

ventures on so slippery an undertaking." The term "slippery" is certainly very happily chosen; and Kant pleads guilty to a lack of clearness. But with regard to certainty he puts on a bold front. "First," he tells us, "with regard to certainty. I have pronounced judgment against myself by saying that in this kind of inquiries it is in no way permissible to propound mere opinions, and that everything looking like a hypothesis is counterband, that must not be offered for sale at however low a price, but must, as soon as discovered, be confiscated."

Here, then, the note of certainty even to cocksureness is unmistakable, and everything like hypothesis is "counterband." But, utterly forgetful of all this, after a brief space, he admits that his theory of the categories was not even a hypothesis, but a mere experiment! He says that, encouraged by the example of mathematics and natural science, which, at a single bound, became real sciences, he was led "to make the experiment . . . of imitating them." "Hitherto," he says, "it has been supposed that all our knowledge must conform to the objects." He determined, therefore, that "the experiment ought to be made, whether we should not succeed better with the problems of metaphysic, by assuming that the objects must conform to our mode of cognition. This is singular language on a subject where not only experiment, but even hypothesis "must be counterband." Instead, therefore, of being driven by the overwhelming force of reason to his theory of the categories, the Kantian categories—such as they are—are a mere haphazard experiment. Of this metaphysical adventure he tells us:

"This experiment succeeds as well as we could desire, and promises to metaphysic, in its first part, which deals with concepts *a priori*, of which the corresponding objects may be given in experience, the secure method of a science."

Kant, however, seems to have at last realized the gross inconsistency of these statements and in his preface to the Second Edition endeavors to extricate himself in this childish fashion:

"I also propose in this my preface my own view of metaphysics, which has so many analogies with the Copernican hypothesis, as an hypothesis only, though in the 'Critique' itself it is proved by means of our representations of space and time, and the elementary concepts of the understanding, not hypothetically, but apodictically" (!)

In other words, all hypothesis were to be "counterband;" but as Kant's theory happens to be a mere hypothesis, he assures us, it is only in his preface that it is "an hypothesis," and that "in the 'Critique' itself" it is proved, and proved "not hypothetically, but

apodictically!" This puerile explanation of the introduction of an hypothesis, where everything of the kind was to be "counterband," must yield in curiosity, however, to the new "apodictic" feature which he here introduces. We are assured that in the "Critique" itself his theory "is apodictically proved." Now, an apodictic proof is one that is necessarily certain and does not admit of question. We can, however, judge of the "apodictic" nature of Kant's proof from the fact that it has been repeatedly challenged from the very start, and since then over and over again. And how "apodictic" Kant himself really regarded it we may learn from Kant himself. Referring to these famous "apodictic" proofs, he tells us:

"But in order to prevent any unnecessary weakening of these arguments, he (the author) may be allowed to point out himself certain passages which, though they refer to collateral subjects only, might occasion some mistrust, and thus counteract in time the influence which the least hesitation of the reader in respect to these minor points might exercise with regard to the principal object."

Again he tells us of his deduction of the categories:

"I therefore warn the reader, in case my subjective deduction should not produce that complete conviction which I expect, that the objective (!) deduction, in which I am here chiefly concerned, must still retain its strength."

These statements are not calculated to inspire unquestioning confidence in Kant's own faith in the "apodictic" certainty of his proofs and conclusions. Nor is the following:

"If people, however, should prefer to call in question all the former proofs of the *Analytic*, rather than allow themselves to be robbed of their possessions of the value of the proofs on which they have rested so long, they surely cannot decline my request when I ask them to justify themselves at least on this point."

And where he resorts to the theory of his phenomena as distinguished from the noumena—a subsidiary theory which he introduces to meet the hiatus in the proofs for his theory of the categories—he says: "If, after all these arguments, anybody should still hesitate to abandon the purely transcendental use of the categories, let him try an experiment with them for framing any synthetic proposition." This is very strange language about conclusions that we have been told are "proved, not hypothetically, but apodictically." But the climax comes when, after heroically cleaving his thirty pages of a pathway "beset with difficulties," through a region "never trodden before," he declares solemnly: "On this ground, as the only possible one, our deduction of the categories has been carried out;" and then—as we have seen above—when he came to revise

his famous work for the second edition, these thirty pages of "apodictical" proof are wiped out as though they never existed; or, as Max Muller puts it: "The Deduction of the Categories is much changed, as seen in Supplement XIV." All this shows us what was Kant's real opinion of the "apodictic" character of his conclusions; and it also shows us incidentally how necessary it is to scrutinize closely and analyze carefully every statement and argument which Kant advances.

Such, then, is Kant's own opinion regarding his deduction of the categories, about which in a moment of gushing enthusiasm, he assures us, he has proved them, "not hypothetically, but apodictically." What Kant has really accomplished can be seen from a close scrutiny of his deduction. Many pages, however, would be required to do ample justice to this portion of the subject, and we can do little more than here indicate in outline Kant's failure. Let us keep in mind meanwhile that the primary duty that necessarily devolved on Kant was to show not this, or that, or the other thing, but that his categories are real and actual forms of the mind, and thus that they have objective reality; and that without this his whole chain of reasoning is but a rope of sand. It is only by keeping this in mind that we shall be able to comprehend the full extent of Kant's failure. Instead of proving this—or, indeed, attempting to prove it—he claims that when he has shown that "the categories are conditions of thought in any possible experience" he has thereby given us a transcendental deduction of them, and therefore shown that they possess objective validity. In other words, Kant imagines that when he has shown us that the categories refer to objects of experience he has shown that they possess objective validity—as real forms of the understanding. Such a claim, however, is fatuity itself. It needs no proof to show the utter absurdity of Kant's position here. All that is necessary is to recall the fact that it is precisely this reference of these categories to objects of experience that can neither be denied nor disproved. Incontrovertible facts never stand in need of proof. And than the reference of the categories to objects of experience, there is nothing in science or philosophy more universally admitted. It was this reference of the categories to all objects of experience that gave Aristotle pause more than twenty-two hundred years ago. It was the curious phenomenon of meeting with the categories everywhere that set him to investigate their nature, to calculate their number, and to investigate their origin. It was the very fact that he could not separate them from the knowledge of the objects of experience that caused him to speculate whether they belonged to the mind, to the objects, or to the mind and objects

combined. It was because of the fact that the categories are found everywhere "referring to objects" that he at last settled down to the conclusion that they belonged to the objects which we meet with in experience. It was this same fact—the necessary reference of the understanding to objects of experience, and this persistent assumption of the form of the categories—that led Locke into a similar speculation. Everywhere and invariably that we find experience of objects there we find the categories in one form or other—and often in all forms. Hence the very fact that started the problem of the categories was their inseparable connection with the mind and its objects, and all Kant's labor was a much ado about nothing. It was the crying fact that they referred to objects which started philosophers on their fruitless quest as to their origin, and which led them to investigate the reason why all knowledge assumes these forms. Is the cause in the objects or in the mind? That was the question to be solved. How do they refer to objects?—not that they refer to objects, was the problem to be solved. The latter was an ever-present truism. Hence the most elaborate piece of folly that any philosopher could devise was to undertake to prove that "the categories are conditions of thought in any possible experience." For it is the incontrovertibility of that selfsame proposition that lies at the very basis of all inquiry concerning the categories. What, then, must be thought of Kant's famous summary—quoted above—of the results of his deduction of the categories, in which he tells us: "This, and no more than this, we were called upon to prove in the transcendental deduction of the categories, namely, to make the relation of the understanding to our sensibility, and through it to all objects of experience, that is the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding, conceivable *a priori*, and thus to establish their origin and their truth?" What must be thought of the assertion?

"Now, I maintain that the categories of which we are speaking are nothing but the conditions of thought in any possible experience. These categories, therefore, are fundamental concepts by which we think objects of all phenomena in general, and have therefore *a priori* objective validity. This is exactly what we wished to prove."

Or of this?

"Such concepts of objects in general must form conditions *a priori* of all knowledge produced by experience, and the objective validity of the categories, as being such concepts *a priori*, rests on this very fact that by them alone, so far as the form of thought is concerned, experience becomes possible."

But thus it is throughout with Kant's proof of the objective validity of the categories. He never attempts to show that they

have a real actual existence as forms of the understanding, but tries to gloss over the failure by pretending that when he has asserted that the categories refer to the objects of experience he has thereby proved their objective validity. He tells us:

"It is therefore the *possibility of experience* (italics Kant's) which alone gives objective reality to all our knowledge *a priori*. . . . Experience depends, therefore, on *a priori* principles of its form, that is, on general rules of unity in the synthesis of phenomena, and the objective reality of these (rules) can always be shown by their being the necessary conditions in all experience."

Here Kant makes the objective validity of the categories depend on the fact that they are necessary conditions in all experience; but sensible people will understand what are the facts in the case, in spite of all desperate efforts to confuse the meaning of a plain problem. And these facts are that *nolens volens* the categories enter into conditions of thought in all our knowledge; and that all Kant's frantic efforts to prove this is simply an attempt to prove what can by no possibility be denied as a fact. They will further understand that this presence of the categories, as conditions of experience, is very far from proving what Kant must prove before his theory is accepted, viz., that saying they are conditions of thought in all experience is the same as proving that the categories have an actual existence in our minds as forms of the understanding independent of all experience. That they are "conditions of thought" does not make for Kant's theory of the categories one iota more than it makes for the theory of Aristotle or for the theory of Locke. It constitutes the very data in the problem to be solved.

Indeed Kant gives away his whole contention when he comes to explain the ground of his distinction of all subjects into phenomena and noumena. We have already called attention to Kant's peculiar tendency to argue from any side and from all sides of any question. Here it is supreme in all its audacious and mendacious effrontery. We have seen that the categories, according to Kant, are actual forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought, and that, according to him, they have an existence in the mind independent of and antecedent to all experience. This was at the beginning—when he first launched his hypothesis. He wished to have this principle stand forth in clear light, in contradistinction to the theories of Locke and Aristotle; and there was no doubt about the genuinity of its ring. This was the great Copernican theory which revolutionized all philosophy and all human knowledge. Then, the characteristic features of the categories were that they had real existence as forms of the understanding, that they

borrowed nothing whatever from experience, that they were prior to and independent of experience, and that they lay prepared in the mind waiting for experience. But as the theory progresses and all this is crying out for necessary proof, Kant at once begins to recede little by little from this bold stand. He merges the objective validity of these categories in the transcendental deduction of them. He tries to make it appear that when he says that they are necessary accompaniments to all thought and all knowledge, that he has thereby proved their objective validity; although this does not count one single step in advance for his theory more than for the opposing theories. And finally he, wittingly or unwittingly, confesses flatly that, in spite of all his boastings and bravado, these categories are neither prior to nor independent of experience, but that apart from experience they have no existence at all, and consequently have no objective validity. Thus they fall with a crash from their lofty and independent height. Apart from experience they are really nothing! This is such a shock—after all the loud blare of trumpets that ushered in the categories—that the reader who grasps it fully cannot believe his senses and is apt to read the lines over and over again before admitting the damning evidence that makes Kant the greatest of all quacks and impostors. But let Kant speak for himself.

"All concepts," he tells us, "therefore, and with them all principles, though they may be possible *a priori*, refer, nevertheless, to empirical intuitions, that is to data of possible experience. Without this they can claim no objective validity, but are a mere play, whether of the imagination or of the understanding with their respective representations."

And again:

"Their use and their relation to objects can nowhere be found except in experience, of which these concepts contain *a priori* the (formal) possibility only."

How are the mighty fallen! and he adds:

"That this is the case with all categories and with all the principles drawn from them becomes evident from the fact that we could not define any one of them without at once having recourse to the conditions of sensibility or the form of phenomena, to which, as their only possible objects, these categories must necessarily be restricted, it being impossible, if we take away these conditions, to assign to them any meaning, that is, any relation to an object, or to make it intelligible to ourselves by any example what kind of thing could be intended by such concepts."

Again, commenting on his inability to define the categories, he says: "Now, however, we can perceive that this caution had a deeper

ground, namely, that we could not have defined them, even if we had wished; for if we remove all conditions of sensibility, which distinguish them as concepts of a possible empirical use, and treat them as concepts of things in general (therefore as of transcendental use), nothing remains but to regard the logical function in judgments as the condition of the possibility of the things themselves, without the slightest indication as to where they could have their application and their object, or how they could have any meaning or objective validity in the pure understanding, apart from sensibility."

Great was the fall, my countrymen! These are the selfsame categories, which apart from sensibility and experience were totally independent and constituted an altogether great and important branch of human knowledge—our knowledge *a priori*—so great, indeed, that it revolutionized all philosophy and formed a safe foundation on which all our empirical knowledge, according to Kant, must rest. But the end is not yet. Kant further tells us:

"It seems to be something strange and even illogical that there should be a concept which must have a meaning, and yet is incapable of any explanation. But the case of these categories is peculiar, because it is only by means of the general sensuous condition that they can acquire a definite meaning and a reference to any objects. That condition being left out in the pure category, it follows that it can contain nothing but the logical function by which the manifold is brought into a concept. By means of this function, that is the pure form of the concept, nothing can be known and distinguished as to any object belonging to it, because the sensuous condition under which alone objects can belong to it, has been removed. Thus we see that the categories require, besides the pure concept of the understanding, certain determinations of their application to sensibility in general (schemata)."

And Kant concludes:

"With all this it remains perfectly undetermined what kind of things they may be with regard to which we have to use one rather than another of these functions, so that without the condition of sensuous intuition, for which they supply the synthesis, the categories have no relation to any definite object, and consequently have not the validity of objective concepts."

Here, then, are categories which loomed up so large on the philosophic horizon and which were independent of all experience; nay, the very things that made experience possible, now made by their creator wholly dependent on experience; for they are dependent on sensibility, and sensibility is only a link in the chain of experience. Without this sensibility and their relation to it

"they have not the validity of objective concepts." In other words, of themselves they have no objective validity. Nay, he tells us that the "pure intuition can receive its object, and with it its objective validity, by an empirical intuition only." Even further explicitness is vouchsafed us—and this where we least expect it—when he tells us: "All concepts . . . and with them all principles, though they may be possible *a priori*, refer, nevertheless, to empirical intuitions. . . . Without this they can claim no objective validity, but are a mere play, whether of the imagination or of the understanding with their respective representations." Two things are noteworthy here: (1) that Kant claims that without empirical intuition the categories can have no objective validity; that is, they are, in other words, non-existent—in spite of the resplendent figure which they at first made on the horizon of the Kantian theory as totally independent of all experience. At first they were independent of experience. They were necessary for experience. There could be no experience without them. But now the tables are completely turned. They are wholly dependent on experience; experience is necessary for their very existence; and without experience there are no categories. And (2) that the objective validity of the categories, which—as we have admonished our readers to keep steadily in mind—consists in their real existence as forms of the understanding, is here made by Kant identical with the receiving of its object by an empirical intuition. He says "the pure intuition can receive its object, and with it its objective validity, by an empirical intuition only." But Kant does not stop here. He tells us plainly that it is only in experience we can have any understanding whatever of the meaning of the categories; although we had already been told most emphatically that they are antecedent to and wholly independent of all experience. He says that "if we take away these conditions of sensibility," that are a necessary link in experience, "it is impossible to assign to them (the categories) any meaning, that is, any relation to an object (consequently their own objective validity) or to make it intelligible to ourselves by any example what kind of thing could be intended by such concepts."

Enough, we think, has been said to show that Kant has wholly misconceived the nature of the problem which he was called upon to solve in proving the objective validity of the categories. Perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say that Kant fully conceived the nature of the problem, but that it was his interest, his purpose and his policy to evade it altogether.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA

DE NOVA PSALTERII IN BREVIARIO ROMANO DISPOSITIONE.

PIUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

DIVINO afflatu compositos Psalmos, quorum est in sacris litteris collectio, inde ab Ecclesiae exordiis non modo mirifice valuisse constat ad fovendam fidelium pietatem, qui offerebant *hostiam laudis semper Deo, id est, fructum labiorum confitentium nomini eius* (Hebr. 13, 15); verum etiam ex more iam in vetere Lege recepto in ipsa sacra Liturgia divinoque Officio conspicuam habuisse partem. Hinc illa, quam dicit Basilius, nata *Ecclesiae vox* (Homil. in Ps. 1 n. 2), atque psalmodia, eius *hymnodiae filia*, ut a decessore Nostro Urbano VIII. appellatur (Bulla "Divinam psalmodiam"), quae canitur assidue ante sedem Dei et Agni, quaeque homines, in primis divino cultui addictos docet, ex Athanasii sententia, qua ratione Deum laudare oporteat quibusque verbis decenter confiteantur (Epist. ad Marcellinum in interpret. Psalmor. n. 10). Pulchre ad rem Augustinus: *Ut bene ab homine laudetur Deus, laudavit se ipse Deus; et quia dignatus est laudare se, ideo invenit homo, quemadmodum laudet eum* (In Psalm 144, n. 1).

Accedit quod in Psalmis mirabilis quaedam vis inest ad excitanda in animis omnium studia virtutum. Etsi enim *omnis nostra Scriptura, cum vetus tum nova, divinitus inspirata utilisque ad doctrinam est, ut scriptum habetur; . . . at Psalmorum liber, quasi paradisus omnium reliquorum* (librorum fructus) *in se continens, cantus edit, et proprios insuper cum ipsis inter psallendum exhibet*. Haec iterum Athanasius (Epist. ad Marcell. cit. n. 2), qui recte ibidem addit: *Mihi quidem videtur, psallenti Psalmos esse instar speculi, ut et seipsum et proprii animi motus in ipsis contempletur, atque ita affectus eos recitet* (Op. cit. n. 12). Itaque Augustinus in Confessionibus: *Quantum, inquit, flevi in hymnis et canticis tuis suave sonantis Ecclesiae tuae vocibus commotus acriter! Voces illae influebant auribus meis et eliquabatur veritas in cor meum et exaestuabat nide affectus pietatis et currebant lacrimae et bene mihi erat cum eis* (Lib. IX., cap. 6). Etenim, quem non moveant frequentes illi Psalmorum loci, in quibus de immensa maiestate Dei, de omnipotentia, de inenarrabili iustitia aut bonitate aut clementia de ceterisque infinitis laudibus eius tam alter praedicatur? Cui non

similes sensus inspirent illae pro acceptis a Deo beneficiis gratiarum actiones, aut pro exspectatis humiles fidentesque preces, aut illi de peccatis clamores paenitentis animae? Quem non admiratione psalter perfundat, cum divinae benignitatis munera in populum Israel atque in omne hominum genus profecta narrat, cumque caelestis sapientiae dogmata tradit? Quem denique non amore inflammet adumbrata studiose imago Christi Redemptoris, cuius quidem Augustinus (In Ps. 42, n. 1) *vocem in omnibus Psalms vel psallentem, vel gemetem, vel laetantem in spe, vel suspirantem in re* audiebat?

Iure igitur optimo provisum est antiquitus, et per decreta Romanorum Pontificum, et per canones Conciliorum, et per monasticas leges, ut homines ex utroque clero integrum Psalterium per singulas hebdomadas concinerent vel recitarent. Atque hanc quidem legem a patribus traditam decessores Nostri S. Pius V., Clemens VIII., Urbanus VIII. in recognoscendo Breviario Romano sancte servarunt. Unde etiam nunc Psalterium intra unius hebdomadae spatium recitandum foret integrum, nisi mutata rerum condicione talis recitatio frequenter impediretur.

Etenim procedente tempore continenter crevit inter fideles eorum hominum numerus, quos Ecclesia, mortali vita defunctos, caelicolis accensere et populo christiano patronos et vivendi duces consuevit proponere. In ipsorum vero honorem Officia de Sanctis sensim propagari coeperunt, unde fere factum est, ut de Dominicis diebus deque Feriis Officia silerent ideoque non pauci neglegerentur Psalmi, qui sunt tamen, non secus ac ceteri, ut Ambrosius ait (Enarrat. in Ps. 1, n. 9) *benedictio populi, Dei laus; plebis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo universorum, vox Ecclesiae, fidei canora confessio, auctoritatis plena devotio, libertatis laetitia, clamor iucunditatis, laetitiae resultatio*. De huiusmodi autem omissione non semel graves fuerunt prudentum piorumque virorum querimoniae, quod non modo hominibus sacri ordinis tot subtraherentur praesidia ad laudandum dominum et ad intimos animi sensus ei significantos aptissima; sed etiam quod optabilis illa in orando varietas desideraretur, ad digne, attente, devote precandum imbecillitati nostrae quam maxime opportuna. Nam, ut Basilius habet, *in aequalitate torpescit saepe, nescio quomodo, animus, atque praesens absens est: mutatis vero et variatis psalmodia et cantu per singulas horas, renovatur eius desiderium et attentio instauratur* (Regulae fusius tractatae, interrog. 37, n. 5).

Minime igitur mirum, quod complures e diversis orbis partibus sacrorum Antistites sua in hanc rem vota ad Apostolicam Sedem detulerunt, maximeque in Concilio Vaticano, cum hoc inter cetera postularunt, ut, quoad posset, revocaretur consuetudo vetus recitandi

per hebdomadam totum Psalterium, ita tamen ut clero, in sacri ministerii vinea ob imminutum operariorum numerum iam gravius laboranti, non maius imponeretur onus. Hisce vero postulationibus et votis, quae Nostra quoque ante susceptum Pontificatum fuerant, itemque precibus, quae deinceps ab aliis Venerabilibus Fratribus piisque viris admotae sunt. Nos equidem concedendum duximus, cauto tamen, ne recitatione integri Psalterii hebdomadae spatio conclusa, ex una parte quicquam de Sanctorum cultu decederet, neve ex altera molestius Divini Officii onus clericis, immo temperatius evaderet. Quapropter, implorato suppliciter *Patre luminum*, corrogatisque in id ipsum suffragiis sanctarum precum, Nos vestigiis insistentes decessorum Nostrorum, aliquot viros delegimus doctos et industrios, quibus commisimus, ut consiliis studiisque collatis certam aliquam reperirent rei efficiendae rationem, quae Nostris optatis responderet. Illi autem commissum sibi munus e sententia exsequentes novam Psalterii dispositionem elaborarunt; quam cum S. R. E. Cardinales sacris ritibus cognoscendis praepositi diligenter consideratam probassent, Nos, utpote cum mente Nostra admodum congruentem, ratam habuimus in rebus omnibus, id est, quod ad ordinem ac partitionem Psalmorum, ad Antiphonas, ad Versiculos, ad Hymnos attinet cum suis Rubricis et Regulis, eiusque editionem authenticam in Nostra typographia Vaticana adornari et indidem vulgari iussimus.

Quoniam vero Psalterii dispositio intimam quandam habet cum omni Divino Officio et Liturgia coniunctionem, nemo non videt, per ea, quae hic a Nobis decreta sunt, primum Nos fecisse gradum ad Romani Breviarii et Missalis emandationem: sed super tali causa proprium mox Consilium seu Commissionem, ut aiunt, eruditorum constituemus. Interim, opportunitatem hanc nacti, nonnulla iam in praesenti instauranda censuimus, prout in appositis Rubricis praescribitur: atque imprimis quidem ut in recitando Divino Officio Lectionibus statutis sacrae Scripturae cum Responsoriis de tempore occurrentibus debitus honor frequentiore usu restitueretur; dein vero ut in sacra Liturgia Missae antiquissimae de Dominicis infra annum et de Feriis, praesertim quadragesimalibus, locum suum recuperarent.

Itaque, harum auctoritate litterarum, ante omnia Psalterii ordinem, qualis in Breviario Romano hodie est, abolemus eiusque usum, inde a Kalendis Januariis anni millesimi nongentesimi decimi tertii, omnino interdiciamus. Ex illo autem die in omnibus ecclesiis Cleri saecularis et regularis, in monasteriis, ordinibus, congregationibus, institutisque religiosorum ab omnibus et singulis, qui ex officio aut ex consuetudine Horas canonicas iuxta Breviarium Romanum, a S. Pio V. editum et a Clemente VIII., Urbano VIII., Leone XIII. recognitum, persolvunt, novum Psalterii ordinem, qualem Nos cum suis Regulis.

et Rubricis approbavimus typisque Vaticanis vulgandum decrevimus, religiose observari iubemus. Simul vero poenas in iure statutas iis denuntiamus, qui suo officio persolvendi quotidie Horas canonicas defuerint; qui quidem sciant se tam gravi non satisfacturos officio, nisi Nostrum hunc Psalterii ordinem adhibeant.

Omnibus igitur Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus ceterisque ecclesiarum Praelatis, ne Cardinalibus quidem Archiepysbyteris patriarchalium Urbis basilicarum exceptis, mandamus, ut in sua quisque diocesi, ecclesia vel coenobio Psalterium cum Regulis et Rubricis, quemadmodum a Nobis dispositum est, constituto tempore inducendum curent: quod Psalterium quasque Regulas et Rubricas etiam a ceteris omnibus, quoscumque obligatio tenet recitandi vel concinendi Horas canonicas, inviolate adhiberi ac servari praecipimus. Interim autem cuilibet et capitulis ipsis, modo id maior capituli pars sibi placere ostenderit, novum Psalterii ordinem, statim post eius editionem, rite usurpare licebit.

Haec vero edicimus, declaramus, sancimus, decernentes has Nostras litteras validas et efficaces semper esse ac fore; non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis, generalibus et specialibus, ceterisque quibusvis in contrarium facientibus. Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae abolitionis, revocationis, permissionis, iussionis, praecepti, statuti, indulti, mandati et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius, se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo nongentesimo undecimo, Kalendis Novembribus, in festo Sanctorum omnium, Pontificatus Nostri anno nono.

FR. SEB. CARDINALIS MARTINELLI,

S. R. C. Praefectus.

A. CARDINALIS AGLIARDI,

S. R. E. Cancellarius.

Loco ✠ Plumbi.

Visa

M. RIGGI, C. A., *Not.*

Reg. in Conc. Ap. N. 571.

RUBRICAE

IN RECITATIONE DIVINI OFFICII

ET IN MISSARUM CELEBRATIONE

SERVANDAE

AD NORMAM CONSTITUTIONIS APOSTOLICAE

"DIVINO AFFLATU."

TITULUS I.

De ratione Divini Officii recitandi iuxta novum Psalterii ordinem.

1. In recitatione Divini Officii, iuxta Romanum Ritus, Psalmi quotidie sumendi sunt, ad singulas Horas canonicas, de occurrente hebdomadae die, prout distribuuntur in Psalterio noviter disposito; quod deinceps, loco veteris dispositionis, in novis Breviarii Romani editionibus vulgandum erit.

2. Excipiuntur tamen omnia Festa Domini eorumque integrae Octavae, Dominicae infra Octavas Nativitatis, Epiphaniae, Ascensionis et Corporis Domini, Vigilia Epiphaniae et FERIA VI. post Octavam Ascensionis, quando de eis persolvendum sit Officium; itemque Vigilia Nativitatis ad Laudes et ad reliquas Horas minores usque ad Nonam, et Vigilia Pentecostes; nec non omnia Festa Beatae Mariae Virginis, SS. Angelorum, S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Ioseph et SS. Apostolorum et Duplicitas I. et II. classis, eorumque omnium integrae Octavae, si de eis fiat Officium, quod recitandum erit prout assignatur, vel in Breviario, vel in Proprio Dioecesis vel Instituti, hac lege tamen ut Psalmi ad Laudes, Horas et Completorium semper sumendi sint ex Dominica, ut in novo Psalterio; ad Matutinum vero et ad Vesperas dicantur ut in Communi, nisi speciales Psalmi sint assignati. Tribus autem ultimis diebus maioris hebdomadae, nil erit innovandum, sed Officium integre persolvendum erit, prout nunc habetur in Breviario, sumptis tamen ad Laudes Psalmis de Feria currenti, ut in novo Psalterio, excepto Cantico Sabbati Sancti, quod etiamnum est "*Ego dixi: In dimidio.*" Ad Completorium sumantur Psalmi de Dominica, uti in novo pariter Psalterio.

3. In quolibet alio Festo Duplici, etiam maiore, vel Semiduplici, vel Simplici, et in Feriis Tempore Paschali semper dicantur Psalmi, cum Antiphonis in omnibus Horis, et Versibus ad Matutinum, ut in Psalterio de occurrenti hebdomadae die; reliqua omnia, et Antiphonae ad *Magnificat* et *Benedictus*, ut in Proprio aut Communi. Quod si aliquod ex Festis huiusmodi proprias vel peculiariter assignatas habeat Antiphonas in aliqua Hora maiori, eas in eadem

ipsa retineat cum suis Psalmis, prout habetur in Breviario: in ceteris Horis Psalmi et Antiphonae dicantur de Feria occurrente.

4. Lectiones ad Matutinum in I. Nocturno semper legendae erunt de Scriptura occurrente, licet aliquando in Breviario Lectiones de Communi assignentur, nisi sit Festum Domini aut Festum cuiusvis ritus B. Mariae Virginis, vel Angelorum, vel S. Ioannis Baptistae, vel S. Ioseph, vel Apostolorum, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut agatur de Festo, quod vel Lectiones habeat proprias, non vero de Communi, vel occurrat in Feriis Lectiones de Scriptura non habentibus, ideoque Lectiones de Communi necessario recipiat. In Festis vero, in quibus hucusque erant Lectiones de Communi, Responsoria vero propria, retineantur eadem Lectiones cum propriis Responsoriis.

5. Porro sic erit persolvendum Officium in Festis Duplicibus et Semiduplicibus superius non exceptis:

Ad Matutinum Invitatorium, Hymnus, Lectiones II. et III. Nocturni ac Responsoria trium Nocturnorum propria, vel de Communi: Antiphonae vero, Psalmi et Versus trium Nocturnorum, nec non Lectiones I. Nocturni de Feria occurrente.

Ad Laudes et ad Vesperas Antiphonae cum Psalmis de Feria; Capitulum, Hymnus, Versus et Antiphona ad *Benedictus* vel ad *Magnificat* cum Oratione aut ex Proprio, aut de Communi.

Ad Horas minores et Completorium Antiphonae cum Psalmis semper dicuntur de occurrente Feria. Ad Primam pro Lectione brevi legitur Capitulum Nonae ex Proprio, vel de Communi. Ad Tertiam, Sextam et Nonam Capitulum, Responsorium breve et Oratio pariter sumuntur vel ex Proprio, vel de Communi.

6. In Officio S. Mariae in Sabbato et in Festis Simplicibus sic Officium persolvendum est: ad Matutinum Invitatorium et Hymnus dicuntur de eodem Officio vel de iisdem Festis; Psalmi cum suis Antiphonis et Versu de Feria occurrente; I. et II. Lectio de Feria, cum Responsoriis propriis, vel de Communi; III. vero Lectio de Officio vel Festo, duabus Lectionibus in unam iunctis, si quando duae pro Festo habeantur: ad reliquas autem Horas omnia dicuntur, prouti supra, n. 5, de Festis Duplicibus expositum est.

7. In Feriis et in Festis Simplicibus Psalmi ad Matutinum, qui in novo Psalterio in tres Nocturnos dispositi inveniuntur, dicantur sine interruptione cum suis novem Antiphonis usque ad tertium Versum inclusive, omissis Versibus primo et secundo.

TITULUS II.

De Festorum praestantia.

1. Ut recte dignoscatur quale ex pluribus Officiis sit praestantius

et proinde sive in occurrentia, sive in concurrentia, sive in ordine repositionis aut translationis praeferendum, sequentes praestantiae characteres considerandi sunt :

(a) *Ritus altior*, nisi occurrat Dominica, vel Feria, vel Octava privilegiata, vel etiam quaelibet dies Octava iuxta Rubricas.

(b) *Ratio Primarii aut Secundarii*.

(c) *Dignitas Personalis*, hoc ordine servato: Festa Domini, B. Mariae Virginis, Angelorum, S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Ioseph, SS. Apostolorum et Evangelistarum.

(d) *Sollemnitatis externa*, scilicet si Festum sit feriatum, aut celebretur cum Octava.

2. In occurrentia, et in ordine repositionis aut translationis, alius quoque character considerandus est, nempe :

(e) *Proprietas Festorum*. Dicitur Festum alicuius loci proprium, si agatur de Titulo Ecclesiae, de loci Patrono etiam secundario, de Sancto (in Martyrologio vel in eius appendice approbata descripto), cuius habetur corpus vel aliqua insignis et authentica reliquia, vel de Sancto, qui cum Ecclesia, vel loco, vel personarum coetu specialem habeat rationem. Igitur Festum quodvis istiusmodi proprium, ceteris paribus, praefertur Festo Universalis Ecclesiae. Excipiuntur tamen Dominicae, Ferae, Octavae et Vigiliae privilegiatae, nec non Festa primaria Duplicia I. classis Universalis Ecclesiae, quae uniuscuiusque loci propria considerantur et sunt. Festum autem Universalis Ecclesiae, cuiusvis ritus, quia est praeceptivum, ceteris paribus, praeferritur Festis aliquibus locis ex mero Indulto S. Sedis concessis, quae tamen propria, sensu quo supra, dici nequeunt.

TITULUS III.

De Festorum occurrentia accidentali eorumque translatione.

1. De Dominicis maioribus I. classis, quodvis Festum in eis occurrat, semper faciendum est Officium: Dominicae vero II. classis cedunt tantummodo Festis Duplicibus I. classis, quo in casu de Dominica fit commemoratio in utrisque Vesperis, Laudibus et Missa cum IX. Lectione ad Matutinum.

2. De Dominicis minoribus, seu per annum, semper fieri debet Officium, nisi occurrat Festum quodcumque Domini, aut aliquod Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut dies Octava Festorum Domini, quo in casu in Officio Festi vel diei Octavae fit commemoratio Dominicae in utrisque Vesperis et Laudibus et Missa cum IX. Lectione ad Matutinum. Si Dominica infra Octavam Nativitatis occurrat in Festo S. Thomae Ep. M. aut in Festo S. Silvestri P. C., fit Officium de ipsa Dominica cum commemoratione Festi occurrentis; quo in casu die 30 Decembris, in Officio diei infra Octavam, Lectiones I.

et II. Nocturni sumuntur e Festo Nativitatis, cum Responsoriis Dominicae. Quoad Dominicam vero, quae occurrit a Festo Circumcisionis usque ad Epiphaniam, nihil innovetur.

3. Duplicitas I. et II. classis, quae seu ab aliqua Dominica maiori, seu a nobiliori Officio impediuntur, transferenda sunt in proximiorum insequentem diem, quae libera sit ab alio Festo Duplici I. vel II. classis, vel ab Officiis huiusmodi Festa excludentibus; salvo tamen privilegio a Rubricis concessio Festivitatis Purificationis et Annuntiationis B. M. V., nec non Commemorationis sollemnis S. Ioseph.

4. Festa Duplicitas maiora cuiusvis dignitatis et Duplicitas minora Doctorum Ecclesiae non amplius transferri possunt, sed quando impediuntur, de eis fiat commemoratio, uti de aliis Duplicitibus minoribus impeditis Rubricae disponunt (salvo quod numero sequenti statuitur de omittenda in Dominicis IX. Lectione historica), nisi forte occurrant in Duplicitibus I. classis, in quibus nullius Officii agenda est commemoratio, nisi de occurrenti Dominica, vel de Feria, aut Octava privilegiata.

5. Porro si in Dominica maiori occurrat Officium Duplex maius aut minus, vel Semiduplex, vel Simplex, fiat de Dominica cum commemoratione Officii occurrentis in utrisque Vesperis (de Simplicibus tamen in primis Vesperis tantum) Laudibus et Missa, sine IX. Lectione historica. Idem fiat in Dominicis minoribus, nisi in eis occurrat Festum quodcumque Domini, aut quodvis Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut dies Octava Festorum Domini, quo in casu, ut supra n. 2 dictum est, fiat de Festo, vel de Octava cum commemoratione et IX. Lectione Dominicae.

6. Dies, in qua celebratur Commemoratio omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, excludit translationem cuiusvis Festi.

TITULUS IV.

De Festorum occurrentia perpetua eorumque repositione.

1. Festa omnia ritus Duplicis sive maioris sive minoris, aut Semiduplicis, si perpetuo impediuntur, reponuntur in primam diem liberam, iuxta Rubricas.

2. Festa Duplicitas I. et II. classis perpetuo impedita reponuntur, tamquam in sedem propriam, in primam diem liberam ab alio Festo Duplici I. aut II. classis, vel ab aliqua die Octava, vel ab Officiis huiusmodi Festa excludentibus, salvo privilegio Festivati Purificationis B. M. V. concessio.

3. Dominicae maiores excludunt assignationem perpetuam cuiusvis Festi Duplicis, etiam I. classis: Dominicae vero minores assignationem excludunt cuiuscumque Duplicis maioris aut minoris, nisi sit

Festum Domini. Festum SS. Nominis Mariae perpetuo assignatur diei duodecimae mensis Septembris.

4. Dies II. Novembris excludit tum Festa occurrentia quae non sint Duplicia I. classis, tum Festa perpetuo reponenda cuiusvis ritus.

TITULUS V.

De concurrentia Festorum.

1. Dominicae maiores Vesperas habent integras in concurrentia cum quovis Festo, nisi sit ritus Duplicis I. aut II. classis: ideoque in primis Vesperis sumuntur Antiphonae cum Psalmis de Sabbato; in Adventu tamen dicuntur Antiphonae de Laudibus Dominicae cum iisdem Psalmis de Sabbato.

2. Dominicae minores cedunt Vesperas, tum Duplicibus I. aut II. classis, tum omnibus Festis Domini, tum diebus Octavis Festorum Domini: integras autem habent Vesperas in concursu cum aliis Festis, sumptis in I. Vesperis Antiphonis et Psalmis de Sabbato.

3. Leges, quibus ordinantur Vesperae infra Octavam Nativitatis Domini, immutatae manent.

TITULUS VI.

De Commemorationibus.

1. In Duplicibus I. classis non fiat commemoratio de praecedenti, nisi fuerit aut Dominica quaevis, etiam per annum, aut Duplex I vel II. classis, aut dies Octava alicuius Festi Domini primarii, aut dies infra Octavam privilegiatam, aut Feria maior. In occurrentia fiat tantum commemoratio de Dominica quacumque, de Octava privilegiata et de Feria maiori. De sequenti vero Officio (etiam ad modum Simplicis redacto) fiat semper commemoratio, minime autem de die infra Octavam non privilegiatam aut de Simplici.

2. In Duplicibus II. classis de praecedenti Officio semper fieri debet commemoratio, nisi fuerit de aliquo Festo Semiduplici, vel de die infra Octavam non privilegiatam. In occurrentia fit commemoratio de quavis Dominica, de quolibet Duplici vel Semiduplici ad modum Simplicis redato, de Octava privilegiata, de Feria maiori et de Vigilia: de Simplici vero fit tantum in Laudibus et in Missis privatis. De sequenti autem Officio quolibet, etiam Simplici vel ad modum Simplicis redacto, fit semper commemoratio, ac etiam de die infra Octavam, si in crastino Officium de ea agendum sit; et tunc cum Antiphona et Versiculo e I. Vesperis Festi.

3. Licet Festa Domini eorumque Octavae privilegio gaudeant ut in occurrentia praeveleant Dominicis minoribus, nihilominus, quando plures fieri debeant commemorations (cauto quod in Vesperis semper fiat prima commemoratio de Officio concurrenti, cuiusvis ritus et dignitatis), tam in Vesperis, quam in Laudibus et Missa hic

ordo servetur: 1.^o de Dominica qualibet; 2.^o de die infra Octavam Epiphaniae aut Corporis Christi; 3.^o de die Octava; 4.^o de Duplici maiore; 5.^o de Duplici minore; 6.^o de Semiduplici; 7.^o de die infra Octavam communem; 8.^o de Feria VI. post Octavam Ascensionis; 9.^o de Feria maiori; 10.^o de Vigilia; 11.^o de Simplici.

TITULUS VII.

De conclusione propria Hymnorum et versu proprio ad Primam, de Suffragiis Sanctorum, de Precibus, de Symbolo Athanasiano et de tertia oratione in Missa.

1. Quando eadem die occurrunt plura Officia, quae propriam habeant conclusionem Hymnorum vel proprium Versum ad Primam, conclusio et Versus dicantur, quae propria sunt Officii, quod ea die recitatur.

2. Deinceps, quando facienda erunt Suffragia Sanctorum, unum tantum fiet Suffragium, iuxta formulam propositam in Ordinario novi Psalterii.

3. Symbolum Athanasianum additur ad Primam in Festo SS. Trinitatis et in Dominicis tantummodo post Epiphaniam et post Pentecosten, quando de eis persolvendum est Officium salva exceptione, de qua n. sequenti.

4. Quando in Dominica fit commemoratio de aliquo Officio Duplici, vel de die Octava, vel de die infra Octavam, omittuntur Suffragium, Preces, Symbolum *Quicumque* et tertia Oratio in Missa.

TITULUS VIII.

De Officiis votivis deque aliis Officiis additiis.

1. Cum per hanc novam Psalterii dispositionem causae cessaverint Indulti Generalis d. d. 5 Iulii 1883 pro Officiis votivis, haec ipsa Officia, et alia similia ex particularibus indultis concessa, tolluntur omnino et sublata declarantur.

2. Cessat pariter obligatio recitandi in Choro, diebus a Rubricis hucusque vigentibus praescriptis, Officium parvum B. Mariae Virginis, Officium Defunctorum, nec non Psalmos Graduales ac Paenitentiales. Capitula vero, quae ad ista Officia addititia ex peculiari constitutione aut legato tenentur, a Sancta Sede eorum commutationem impetrabunt.

3. In Festo S. Marci et in Triduo Rogationum integrum manet onus recitandi Litanias Sanctorum, etiam extra Chorum.

TITULUS IX.

De Festis Dedicationis ac Tituli Ecclesiae et de Patronis.

1. Festum Dedicationis cuiuslibet Ecclesiae est semper primum, et Festum Domini.

2. Anniversarium Dedicationis Ecclesiae Cathedralis et Festum Titulare eiusdem celebranda sunt sub ritu Duplici I. classis cum Octava per totam Dioecesim ab universo Clero saeculari et etiam regulari Kalendarium Dioecesanum adhibente: a Regularibus vero utriusque sexus in eadem Dioecesi commorantibus ac proprium Kalendarium habentibus, pariter sub ritu duplici I. classis, absque tamen Octava.

3. Quum Sacrosancta Lateranensis Archibasilica omnium Ecclesiarum Urbis et Orbis sit mater et caput, tum ipsius Dedicationis Anniversarium, tum Festum Transfigurationis Domini, quod, praeter magnam Resurrectionis Dominicae sollemnitatem, tamquam Titulare ab ipsa recoli solet, ab universo Clero tam saeculari quam regulari, etiam ab illis qui peculiarem ritum sequuntur, sub ritu Duplici II. classis deinceps celebrabitur.

4. Festum Patroni principalis Oppidi, vel Civitatis, vel Dioecesis, vel Provinciae, vel Nationis, Clerus saecularis, et regularis ibi degens et Kalendarium Dioecesanum sequens sub ritu Duplici I classis cum Octava celebrabit: Regulares vero ibidem commorantes et Kalendarium proprium habentes, idem Festum, quamvis feriatum numquam fuerit, eodem ritu celebrabunt, absque tamen Octava.

TITULUS X.

De Missis in Dominicis et Feriis deque Missis pro Defunctis.

1. In Dominicis, etiam minoribus, quodcumque Festum occurrat, dummodo non sit Festum Domini, vel eius dies Octava, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, Missa semper dicenda erit de Dominica cum commemoratione festi. Quod si Festum commemorandum sit Duplex, tunc omittenda est III. Oratio.

2. In Feriis Quadragesimae, Quatuor Temporum, II. Rogationum, et in Vigiliis, si occurrat fieri Officium alicuius Festi Duplicis (non tamen I. vel II. classis) aut Semiduplicis, Missae privatae dici poterunt ad libitum, vel de Festo cum commemoratione ultimoque Evangelio Feriae aut Vigiliae, vel de Feria aut Vigilia cum commemoratione Festi: prohibentur tamen Missae votivae privatae, aut privatae pro Defunctis: quae item prohibentur in Feria, in qua anticipanda vel reponenda est Missa Dominicae. In Quadragesima vero Missae privatae Defunctorum celebrari tantum poterunt prima die cuiuscumque hebdomadae libera in Kalendario Ecclesiae, in qua Missa celebratur.

3. Si alicubi aliquod Festum impeditum a Dominica minore, celebratur *ex voto*, vel cum populi concursu (cuius rei iudex erit Ordinarius), Missae de eodem festo impedito celebrari poterunt, dummodo una Missa de Dominica ne omittatur. Quoties extra

ordinem Officii cantetur vel legatur aliqua Missa, si facienda sit commemoratio aut Dominicae, aut Feriae, aut Vigiliae, semper de hisce etiam Evangelium in fine legatur.

4. Ad Missam Dominicae etiam minoris, cum commemoratione Festi Duplicis tum maioris tum minoris ac diei infra Octavam quomodolibet celebrandam, retinetur color proprius Dominicae, cum Praefatione SSmae Trinitatis, nisi adsit propria Temporis, vel Octavae alicuius Festi Domini.

5. Leges pro Missis Defunctorum in cantu, immutatae manent. Missae vero lectae permittuntur in Duplicibus tantummodo in die obitus, aut pro die obitus, dummodo ne sit Festum de praecepto, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, vel Feria excludens Duplicia I. classis. Quoad vero Missas lectas Defunctorum dicendas diebus ritus Semiduplicis aut Simplicis, in posterum numquam celebrari poterunt in Feriis n. 2 enumeratis, salva tamen exceptione ibidem admissa. Licebit tamen in huiusmodi Missis de Feria orationem addi pro Defunctis, pro quibus Sacrificium applicatur, paenultimo loco, prout permittit Rubrica Missalis. Cum autem ut applicari possint Indulgentiae Altaris privilegiati, Missae Defunctorum debuerint hucusque in nigris celebrari, Summus Pontifex easdem indulgentias in posterum benigne concedit, licet Missa dicatur de Feria, cum oratione pro Defunctis. In reliquis autem Feriis per annum n. 2 non exceptis, nec non in Semiduplicibus, infra Octavas non privilegiatas et in Simplicibus, Missae Defunctorum sicut et aliae Missae votivae dici poterunt iuxta Rubricas.

TITULUS XI.

De Collectis in Missis.

Quod ad Collectas ab Ordinariis locorum imperatas attinet, deinceps prohibentur (nisi sint pro re gravi praescriptae) non tantum in Vigiliis Nativitatis et Pentecostes et in Duplicibus I. classis, sed etiam in Duplicibus II. classis, in Dominicis Maioribus, infra Octavas privilegiatas, et quandocumque in Missa dicendae sint plus quam tres Orationes a Rubrica eo die praescriptae.

TITULUS XII.

De Missis Conventualibus.

In Ecclesiis, in quibus adest obligatio Chori, una tantum Missa cum assistentia Choralium semper celebretur; et quidem de Officio diei, nisi aliter Rubricae disponant; aliae Missae, quae hucusque cum praedicta assistentia celebrabantur, in posterum extra Chorum legantur, post propriam Horam Canonicam; excipiuntur tamen ab

hac regula Missae in Litaniiis maioribus et minoribus, et Missae in Festo Nativitatis Domini. Excipiuntur pariter Missae in anniversariis Creationis et Coronationis Summi Pontificis, Electionis et Consecrationis seu Translationis Episcopi, nec non in anniversario ultimi Episcopi defuncti, et omnium Episcoporum aut Canoniorum; omnesque Missae ex fundatione.

TITULUS XIII.

De Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum.

1. In Commemoratione omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, omissis Officio et Missa diei currentis, fit tantum Officium cum Missa pro Defunctis, prout in Appendice novi Psalterii praescribitur.

2. Si die 2 Novembris occurrat Dominica vel aliquod Duplex I. classis, Commemoratio Defunctorum celebrabitur die proxime sequenti, similiter non impedita; in qua, si forte occurrat Duplex II. classis, hoc transfertur iuxta regulam traditam Tit. III., n. 3.

PRÆSCRIPTIONES TEMPORARIAE.

I.^o Kalendaria uniuscuiusque Dioeceseos, aut Ordinis seu Congregationis Breviario Romano utentium, pro anno 1913, ad Regulas supra traditas omnino redigenda sunt.

II.^o Diebus Dominicis, quibus in Kalendaris proximi anni 1912 inscribuntur, sub ritu Duplici maiori vel minori, Festa Sanctorum, vel Angelorum, vel etiam B. Mariae Virginis, vel dies Octava, quae non sit Festorum Domini, tum Officium in privata recitatione, tum Missae lectae erunt ad libitum, vel prout notatur in Kalendario anni 1912, vel de Dominica cum commemoratione duplicis maioris aut minoris. In Feriis quoque, de quibus Tit. X., n. 2, Missae privatae celebrari poterunt, ut ibi adnotatur.

III.^o Quod Tit. XIII. harum Rubricarum dispositum est quoad Commemorationem Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, inde ab anno 1912, in usum omnino deducendum est.

IV.^o Usque dum nova correctio Breviarii et Missalis Romani, a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro decreta, vulgetur:

(a) Kalendaria perpetua Sacrae Rituum Congregationi reformanda et approbata deferri non debent;

(b) De Festorum augendo ritu, vel de Festis novis invehendis nulla fiat postulatio;

(c) Festa particularia, sive B. Mariae Virginis, sive Sanctorum aut Beatorum, ritus Duplicis maioris aut minoris, Dominicis diebus assignata, locorum Ordinarii seu Superiores Regularium, aut in

utrisque Vesperis, Laudibus et Missa commemoranda praescribant; aut in aliam diem, validis S. R. C. oblatiis argumentis, transferenda curent; aut potius omittant.

(d) Nulla interim facta correctione Rubricarum, Regulae superius traditae in novis Breviariis et Missalibus post Rubricas Generales inserantur, omissis S. R. C. Decretis, quae hucusque in principio Breviarii inserta inveniuntur.

(e) In futuris Breviarii editionibus mutantur, ob novam Psalterii reformationem, sequentes Antiphonae in Laudibus:

In Dominica Sexagesimae:

Ant. 5. In excelsis * laudate Deum.

In Dominica III. Quadragesimae:

Ant. 3. Adhaesit anima mea * post te, Deus meus.

In Dominica IV. Quadragesimae:

Ant. 3. Me suscepit * dextera tua, Domine.

In Feria IV. Maioris Hebdomadae:

Ant. 3. Tu autem, Domine, * scis omne consilium eorum adversum me in mortem.

Ant. 5. Fac, Domine, * iudicium iniuriam patientibus: et vias peccatorum disperde.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

ON THE NEW ARRANGEMENT OF THE PSALTERY

IN THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

PIUS BISHOP

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

FOR PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

DIVINO AFFLATU) It is beyond question that the Psalms composed under Divine inspiration, which are collected in the Sacred Books, have from the beginning of the Church not only contributed wonderfully to foster the piety of the faithful offering the sacrifice of praise always to God, that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing to His name (Heb. xiii., 15), but have also had a conspicuous part, from custom introduced under the Old Law, in the sacred liturgy itself and in the divine office. Hence, as Basil says, that natural voice of the Church (Homil. in Ps. i., n. 2,) and the psalmody called by our predecessor, Urban VIII. (Bulla "Divinam psalmodian"), the daughter of her hymnody which is constantly sung before the throne of God and the Lamb, and which, according to Athanasius, teaches the men whose chief care is the divine worship the manner in which God is to be praised and the words in which they art fitly to confess Him (Epist. ad Marcellinum in interpret. Psalmor, n. 10). Augustine beautifully says on the subject: "That God may be praised well by man, God Himself has praised Himself; and since He has been pleased to praise Himself man has found the way to praise Him (In Psalm cxliv., n. 1).

Besides, there is in the Psalms a certain wonderful power for stimulating zeal in men's minds for all the virtues. For although all our Scripture, both the Old and New, is divinely inspired and useful for doctrine, as is written, the Book of Psalms, like a paradise containing in itself (the fruits) of all the others, gives forth songs, and with them also shows its own songs in psalmody (cantus edit, et proprios insuper cum ipsis inter psallendum exhibet). Such are the words of Athanasius (Epist. ad Marcell. cit., n. 2), who rightly adds in the same place: "To me it seems that the Psalms for him who sings them are as a mirror in which he may contemplate himself and the movements of his soul and, under this influence, recite

them" (Op. cit., n. 12). Hence Augustine says in his Confessions: "How I wept in hymns and canticles, deeply moved by the voices of your sweetly sounding Church! These voices poured into my ears and truth became clear in my heart and then feelings of piety grew warm within me and my tears flowed and it was well with me for them" (Lib. IX., cap. 6). For who can fail to be stirred by those numerous passages of the Psalms which proclaim so loudly the immense majesty of God, His omnipotence, His ineffable justice or goodness or clemency, and His other infinite praises? Who can fail to be inspired with similar feelings by those thanksgivings for benefits received from God, or by those and trustful prayers for benefits desired, or those cries of the penitent soul for its sins? Who is not stirred to admiration by the Psalmist as he recounts the acts of divine goodness towards the people of Israel and the whole race of man and when he hands down the dogmas of heavenly wisdom? Who is not kindled with love by the picture of Christ the Redeemer lovingly shadowed forth whose voice Augustine heard in all the Psalms, praising or mourning, rejoicing in hope or yearning for accomplishment? (In Ps. xlii., n. 1.)

With good reason was provision made long ago, by decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, by canons of the Councils, and by monastic laws, that members of both branches of the clergy should chant or recite the entire Psalter every week. And this same law, handed down from antiquity, our predecessors St. Pius V., Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. religiously observed in revising the Roman Breviary. Even at present the Psalter should be recited in its entirety within the week, were it not that owing to the changed condition of things such recitation is frequently hindered.

For in the course of time there has been a constant increase among the faithful in the number of those whom the Church, after their mortal life, has been accustomed to count among the denizens of heaven and to set before the Christian people as patrons and models. In their honor the offices of the saints began to be gradually extended until it has come about that the offices of the Sundays and ferias are hardly ever heard, and thus neglect has fallen on not a few Psalms, albeit these are, no less than the others, as Ambrose says (Enerrat, in Ps. i., n. 9) "the benediction of the people, the praise of God, the praising of the multitude, the rejoicing of all, the speech of all, the voice of the Church, the resounding confession of faith, the full devotion of authority, the joy of liberty, the cry of gladness, the echo of joy." More than once serious complaints have been made by prudent and pious men about this omission; on the ground that owing to it those in sacred orders have been deprived of so many admirable aids for praising the Lord and ex-

pressing the inmost feelings of the soul, and that it has left them without that desirable variety in praying so highly necessary for our weakness in supplicating worthily, attentively and devoutly. For, as Basil has it, "the soul, in some strange way, frequently grows torpid in sameness, and what should be present to it becomes absent; whereas by changing and varying the psalmody and the chant for the different hours, its desire is renewed and its attention restored. (*Regulæ fusius tractatæ*, interrog. 37, n. 5.)

No wonder, then, that a great many Bishops in various parts of the world have sent expressions of their opinions on this matter to the Apostolic See, and especially in the Vatican Council when they asked, among other things, that the ancient custom of reciting the whole Psalter within the week might be restored as far as possible, but in such a way that the burden should not be made any heavier for the clergy, whose labors in the vineyard of the sacred ministry are now increased owing to the diminution in the number of the laborers. These petitions and wishes, which were our own, too, before we assumed the Pontificate, and also the appeals which have since come from others of our venerable brothers and from pious men, we have decided should be granted—but with care, so that from the reciting of the entire Psalter within the week no diminution in the cultus of the saints may follow, on the one hand, and on the other, that the burden of the divine office may become not more oppressive, but actually lighter. Wherefore, after having suppliantly implored the Father of Lights and asked for the assistance of holy prayers on the matter, following in the footsteps of our predecessor, chose a number of learned and active men with the task of studying and consulting together in order to find some way, which might meet our wishes, for putting the idea into execution. In fulfillment of the charge entrusted to them they elaborated a new arrangement of the Psalter, and this having been approved by the Cardinals of H. R. C. belonging to the Congregation of Sacred Rites, we have ratified it as being in entire harmony with our own mind, in all things, that is as regards the order and partition of the Psalms, the antiphons, versicles, hymns with their rubrics and rules, and we have ordered an authentic edition of it to be set up in our Vatican printing press and then published.

As the arrangement of the Psalter has a certain intimate connection with all the divine office and the Liturgy, it will be clear to everybody that by what we have here decreed we have taken the first step to the emendation of the Roman Breviary and the Missal, but for this we shall appoint shortly a special Council or Commission. Meanwhile, now that the occasion presents itself, we have decided

to make some changes at present, as is prescribed in the accompanying rubrics; and first among them, that in the recitation of the divine office due honor, by their more frequent use, be restored to the appointed lessons of Sacred Scripture with the responsories of the season, and, second, that in the Sacred Liturgy those most ancient Masses of the Sundays during the year and of the ferias, especially those of Lent, recover their place.

Therefore, by the authority of these letters, we first of all abolish the order of the Psalter as it is at present in the Roman Breviary, and we absolutely forbid the use of it after the 1st of January of the year 1913. From that day in all the churches of the secular and regular clergy, in the monasteries, orders, congregations and institutes of religious, by all and several who by office or custom recite the canonical hours according to the Roman Breviary issued by St. Pius V. and revised by Clement VIII., Urban VIII. and Leo XIII., we order the religious observance of the new arrangement of the Psalter in the form in which we have approved it and decreed its publication by the Vatican Printing Press. At the same time we proclaim the penalties prescribed in law against all who fail in their office of reciting the canonical hours every day; all such are to know that they shall not be satisfying this grave duty unless they use this our disposition of the Psalter.

We command, therefore, all the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots and other prelates of churches, not excepting even the Cardinal Archpriests of the patriarchal basilicas of the city, to take care to introduce at the appointed time into their respective dioceses, churches or monasteries, the Psalter with the rules and rubrics as arranged by us, and the Psalter and these rules and rubrics we order to be also inviolately used and observed by all others who are under the obligation of reciting or chanting the canonical hours. In the meanwhile it shall be lawful for everybody and for the chapters themselves, provided the majority of a chapter be in favor, to use duly the new order of the Psalter immediately after its publication.

This we publish, declare, sanction, decreeing that these our letters always are and shall be valid and effective, notwithstanding Apostolic Constitutions and ordinances, general and special, and everything else whatsoever to the contrary. Wherefore let nobody infringe or temerarily oppose this page of our abolition, revocation, permission, ordinance, precept, statute, indult, mandate and will. But if anybody shall presume to attempt this let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God and of His Apostles the Blessed Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's in the year of the incarnation of

our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eleven, on November the first, the feast of All Saints, in the ninth year of our Pontificate.

A. CARD. AGLIARDI, Chancellor of H. R. C.—
FR. SEB. CARD. MARTINELLI, Prefect of
the S. C. R.

Visa

M. RIGGI, C. A., *Not.*

RUBRICS.

FOR THE RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE

AND THE CELEBRATION OF MASS

ACCORDING TO CONSTITUTION DIVINO AFFLATU.

TITULUS I.

On the method of reciting the divine office according to the new order of the Psaltery.

1. In the recitation of the divine office, according to the Roman Rite, the Psalms for each of the canonical hours are to be taken daily from the day of the week as they are distributed in the newly arranged Psaltery which is to be published, to take the place of the old arrangements, in the new editions of the Roman Breviary.

2. But exception is to be made for all the feasts of our Lord and their entire octaves, the Sundays within the octaves of the Nativity, Epiphany, the Ascension and Corpus Domini, the vigil of the Epiphany and the Friday after the octave of the Ascension, when the office of these days is to be said; so also for the vigil of the Nativity at Lauds and at the other little hours up to none, and the vigil of Pentecost; also for all the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the Holy Angels, of St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, the Saints, Apostles and doubles of the first and second class, and for the entire octaves of all of them, if their office is said, which is to be said in the manner assigned, either in the Breviary or in the Proper of the diocese or institute, with this rule, however, that the Psalms and lauds, the hours and complin are to be taken from the Sunday, as in the new Psaltery; but at Matins and Vespers they are to be said as given in the Common unless where special Psalms are assigned. For the last three days of the Holy Week no change is to be made, but the office is to be said integrally as it now exists in the Breviary, the Psalms at lauds, however, being taken from the current Feria as in the new Psaltery, with the exception of the canticle of Holy Saturday, which remains still: *Ego dixi: In dimidio.*

At complin the Psalms are taken from the Sunday as in the new Psalter.

3. In every other double or major double feast, or in a semi-double or simple, and in the ferias during Eastertide the Psalms with their antiphons at all the hours and the verses at Matins are to be said as they are given in the Psalter for the occurring day of the week; all the rest, and the antiphons at the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, as in the Proper or Common. But if any such feasts have proper or specially assigned antiphons in any of the greater hours it shall retain them in the same with its Psalms as given in the Breviary: in the other hours the Psalms and antiphons are to be said from the occurring feria.

4. The lessons at Matins in the first Nocturn are always to be read from the occurring Scripture, even though sometimes in the Breviary lessons from the Common be assigned—except on feasts of our Lord or feasts, of any class, of the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, the Apostles or a double of the first or second class, or in the case of a feast which has its lessons proper and not from the Common or which occurs in ferias which have no lessons from the Scripture, and therefore necessarily take their lessons from the Common. In feasts in which hitherto there were lessons from the Common but proper responsories, the same lessons with the proper responsories are to be retained.

5. In double and semi-double feasts not excepted above the office is to be said as follows:

At Matins, invitatorium, hymn, lessons of the second and third nocturn and responsories of the three nocturns proper or from the Common; the antiphons, psalms and verses of the three nocturns and the lessons of the first nocturn from the occurring feria.

At Lauds and Vespers the antiphons with psalms from the feria; the chapter, hymn, verses and antiphons at the *Benedictus* or *Magnificat*, with the prayer either from the Proper or from the Common.

At Little Hours and Complin the antiphons with the Psalms are always said from the occurring feria. At prime for the short lesson is read the chapter of None from the Proper or Common. At Tierce, Sext and None, the Chapter, Short Responsory and Prayer are likewise taken from the Proper or the Common.

6. In the Saturday Office of Our Lady and in simple feasts the office is to be said thus: At Matins the Invitatorium and Hymn are said from the same office or the same feasts; the Psalms with their antiphons and verse from the occurring feria; the first and second lessons from the feria, with responsories proper or from the Common; the third lesson from the office or feast, the two lessons being joined whenever there are two lessons for the feast:

at the other hours all are said as set forth above in No. 5 for double feasts.

7. In *ferias* and in simple feasts the Psalms at Matins, which are found in the new Psalter distributed into three nocturns, are to be said without interruption with their nine antiphons to the third verse inclusively, omitting the first and second verses.

TITULUS II.

On the order of importance of feasts.

1. To judge rightly which of several offices is higher, and, consequently, either in occurrence or concurrence or in order of deferment or translation is to be chosen, the following characteristics of dignity are to be considered:

(a) *Higher Rite*, unless when there occurs a privileged Sunday, or octave day, or even any octave day according to the rubrics;

(b) *The Quality of Primary or Secondary*:

(c) *Personal Dignity*, according to the following order: Feasts of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Angels, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, Saints, Apostles and Evangelists;

(d) *External Solemnity*, that is, if the feast is *feriatum* or if it is celebrated with an octave.

2. In cases of *occurrence*, and in order of deferment or translation, another characteristic also is to be considered, viz.:

(e) The quality of *Proper* in feasts. A feast is said to be *proper* of a place in the case of the title of a church, the patron, even secondary, of the place, a saint (described in the Martyrology or in its approved appendix) whose body or any notable and authentic relic of whom is possessed, or a saint who has some special connection with the church, or the place, or the community. Therefore, any proper feast of this kind, *ceteris paribus*, takes precedence of a feast of the Universal Church; to be excepted, however, are the privileged Sundays, *ferias*, octave days and vigils, as well as primary double feasts of the first class of the Universal Church, which are considered and are proper of all places. A feast of Universal Church, of any rite whatsoever, inasmuch as it is preceptive, is, *ceteris paribus*, to take precedence of feasts granted to special places by mere indult of the Holy See, which cannot be said to be *proper* in the sense above described.

TITULUS III.

On the accidental occurrence and translation of feasts.

1. On major Sundays of the first class, whatever feast may occur on them, their office is always to be said; Sundays of the second class give way only to double feasts of the first class, in which case

commemoration of the Sunday is made in both Vespers, Lauds and in the Mass, together with the ninth lesson at Matins.

2. On minor Sundays, or Sundays through the year, the office of the day is always to be said, unless there occurs any feast of our Lord, or a double of the first or second class, or an octave day of the feast of our Lord, in which case in the office of the feast or octave day commemoration is made of the Sunday in both Vespers, Lauds and Mass, with the ninth lesson at Matins. If the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity occurs on the feast of St. Thomas, B. and M., or on the feast of St. Sylvester, B. and C., the office of the Sunday is said with the commemoration of the occurring feast; in which case on December 30, in the office of the day within the octave, the lessons of the first and second nocturns are taken from the feast of the Nativity, with the responsories of the Sunday. With regard to the Sunday which falls between the feast of the Circumcision and the Epiphany no change is to be made.

3. Doubles of the first and second class which are hindered either by some major Sunday or by some higher office are to be transferred to the nearest following day which is free from another double feast of the first or second class, or from offices excluding such feast, saving, however, the privilege conceded by the Rubrics to the feasts of the Purification and Annunciation of the B. V. M. and of the solemn commemoration of St. Joseph.

4. Double major feasts of whatever dignity and double minor feasts of the doctors of the Church can no longer be transferred, but when they are hindered, commemoration is made of them, as the Rubrics prescribe for other hindered double minor feasts (saving what is laid down in the following paragraph concerning the omission on Sundays of the ninth historical lesson) unless they happen to occur on doubles of the first class, in which commemoration is to be made of no office, except of the occurring Sunday, or feria, or privileged octave.

5. If in a major Sunday there occurs a double major or minor office, or a semi-double or simple, the office of the Sunday is to be said with commemoration of the occurring office in both Vespers (but only in first Vespers for a simple feast), lauds and Mass, without the ninth historical lesson. So also the Sunday office is to be said in minor Sundays, unless there occurs on them any feast of our Lord, or any double of the first and second class, or the octave day of a feast of our Lord, in which case, as has been said above in No. 1, the office is to be of the feast or of the octave day with the commemoration and ninth lesson of the Sunday.

6. The day on which is celebrated the commemoration of all the faithful departed excludes the translation of any feast whatsoever.

TITULUS IV.

On the perpetual occurrence of feasts and their translation.

1. All double feasts, major or minor, or semi-doubles, which are perpetually hindered are transferred to the first free day, according to the Rubrics.

2. Double feasts of the first and second class perpetually hindered are transferred, as to their proper place, to the first day free from another double feast of the first or second class or from any octave day, or from offices excluding feasts of this kind, saving the privilege conceded to the feast of the Purification of the B. V. M.

3. Major Sundays excluded the perpetual assignation of any double feast even of the first class: Minor Sundays exclude the assignation of any major or minor double, except it be a feast of our Lord. The feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary is perpetually assigned to September 12.

4. November 2 excludes both occurring feasts which are not doubles of the first class and perpetually transferred feasts of whatever rank.

TITULUS V.

On the concurrence of feasts.

1. Major Sundays have integral Vespers in concurrence with any feast whatsoever unless it be a double of the first or second class; therefore, in the first Vespers the antiphons with the Psalms are taken from the Saturday; but in Advent the antiphons are said from the Sunday Lauds, with the Saturday Psalms.

2. Minor Sundays cede Vespers to doubles of the first and second class to all feasts of our Lord and to the octave days of the feasts of our Lord; they have, however, integral Vespers when in concurrence with other feasts, the antiphons and Psalms in first Vespers being taken from the Saturday.

3. The rules regulating Vespers within the octave of the Nativity of our Lord remain unchanged.

TITULUS VI.

On Commemorations.

1. On doubles of the first class commemoration of the preceding office is not made, unless the latter be Sunday, even *per annum*, or a double of the first or second class, or the octave day of some primary feast of our Lord, or a day within a privileged octave, or a major feria. In occurring offices commemoration is made only of the Sunday, of whatever rite it be, a privileged octave and a

major feria. Of the following office (even when celebrated as a simple) commemoration is always to be made—but not of a day within a non-privileged octave or of a simple.

2. In doubles of the second class commemoration is always to be made of the preceding office, unless this be of a semi-double feast or of a day within a non-privileged octave. In cases of occurrence commemoration is made of every Sunday, of every double or semi-double reduced to a simple, of a privileged octave, or a major feria and of a vigil; but of a simple, commemoration is made only at Lauds and in private Masses. But of any following office, even a simple or one observed as a simple, commemoration is always to be made, and also of the day within the octave if the office of this is to be observed on the following day; and in that case with the antiphon and versicle and first Vespers of the feast.

3. Although the feasts of our Lord and their octave days have the privilege of prevailing over minor Sundays when they occur with these, still when several commemorations are to be made (remembering always that in the Vespers the first commemoration is of the concurring office whatever be its rite and dignity) the following order is to be observed both in Vespers and in Lauds and Mass: First, of the Sunday whatever its rank; second, of the day within the octave of Epiphany or Corpus Christi; third, of an octave day; fourth, of a major double; fifth, of a minor double; sixth, of a semi-double; seventh, of a day within a common octave; eighth, of the Friday after the octave of the Ascension; ninth, of a major feria; tenth, of a vigil; eleventh, of a simple.

TITULUS VII.

On the proper conclusion of hymns and on the proper Verse at Prime, on the Suffrages of the Saints, the Prayers, the Athanasian Creed and the third Oratio in Mass.

1. When on the same day there occur several offices which have a proper conclusion of the hymns or a proper verse at prime, the conclusion and verse to be said are those which are proper of the office which is recited on that day.

2. Henceforth, when the suffrages of the saints should be said, only one suffrage is to be recited according to the formula proposed in the ordinary of the new Psalter.

3. The Athanasian Creed is added at prime in the feast of the Holy Trinity and in the Sundays only after Epiphany and after Pentecost, when the office of these is to be followed, saving the exception made in the following paragraph.

4. When on a Sunday commemoration is made of any double office, or of an octave day, or of a day within an octave, the suffrage,

prayers, symbol *Quicumque* and the third oratio in the Mass are omitted.

TITULUS VIII.

On the Votive Office and on additional Offices.

1. Since by this new disposition of the Psalter the causes of the general indult of July 5, 1883, for votive offices, these offices and other similar ones granted by special indults are entirely removed and are pronounced to be removed.

2. So also ceases the obligation of reciting in choir, on the days prescribed by the Rubrics heretofore in force, the little office of the Blessed Virgin, the office of the dead and the gradual and penitential Psalms. But the chapters which are under obligation to recite these additional offices by reason of some special constitution or legally shall ask for the commutation of them by the Holy See.

3. On the feast of St. Mark and in the triduum of rogations the obligation of reciting the Litany of the Saints, even out of choir, still remains.

TITULUS IX.

On the Feasts of Dedication and of the Title of a Church and on the Patrons.

1. The feast of the dedication of every church is always primary and a feast of our Lord.

2. The anniversary of the dedication of a cathedral church and the titular feast of the same are to be celebrated with the rite of double of the first class with octave throughout the whole diocese by all the clergy, regular as well as secular, who use the diocesan calendar; and by regulars of both sexes living in the diocese who use their own calendar, as a double of the first class, but without an octave.

3. As the sacred Lateran Archbasilica is mother and head of all churches of the city and the world, both the anniversary of its dedication and the feast of the Transfiguration of our Lord, which, in addition to the great solemnity of the Resurrection of our Lord, is wont to be commemorated by it as titular, shall henceforth be celebrated as the double of the second class by all the clergy, secular and regular, including even those who follow some special rite.

4. The feast of the principal patron of a town, city, diocese, province or nation shall be celebrated as a double of the first class with octave by all clergy, secular and regular, who live therein and use the diocesan calendar; but by the regulars who live therein and use their own calendar the said feast, although never *feriatum*, shall be celebrated under the same rite, but without an octave.

TITULUS X.

On the Masses on Sundays and Ferias and on Masses for the Dead.

1. On Sundays, even minor ones, whatever feast occur, provided it be not a feast of our Lord or its octave day, or a double of the first or second class, the Mass of the Sunday shall always be said with commemoration of the feast. If the feast to be commemorated is a double, the third *Oratio* is to be omitted.

2. In the ferias of Lent, quartertense, second rogations and in vigils, if the office to be said is that of a double feast (but not of the first or second class) or a semi-double, private Masses may be said *ad libitum*, either of the feast with commemoration and last Gospel of the feria or vigil, or of the feria or vigil with commemoration of the feast; but private votive Masses or private Masses of the dead are forbidden on a feria, and these also are forbidden on a feria on which the Mass of the Sunday is to be anticipated or deferred. In Lent private Masses of the dead can be said only on the first week-day free in the calendar of the church in which the Mass is celebrated.

3. When in any place a feast hindered by a minor Sunday is celebrated *ex voto* or with frequentation of the people (of which the Ordinary shall be the judge) Masses of the said hindered feast can be celebrated, provided one Mass of the Sunday be not omitted. Whenever a Mass is sung or read out of the order of the office, if a commemoration is to be made of a Sunday or feria or vigil, the Gospel of these is also to be read at the end.

4. At the Mass of a Sunday, even a minor one, with commemoration of a double feast, major or minor, and of a day within an octave howsoever to be celebrated, the proper color of the Sunday is to be retained, with the preface of the Most Holy Trinity, unless when there is a proper preface of the season or that of the octave of a feast of our Lord.

5. The laws for sung Masses of the dead remain unchanged. Read Masses are permitted on doubles only on the day of the death, or for the day of the death, provided it be not a feast of obligation, or a double of the first or second class or a feria excluding doubles of the first class. As regards read Masses of the dead to be said on days of semi-double or simple rite, for the future they can never be celebrated on the ferias enumerated in No. 2, saving the exception admitted therein.

But it shall be lawful in such Masses of the feria to add the *Oratio pro Defunctis* for whom the Sacrifice is applied, in the last place but one, as the rubric of the Missal permits. But since for the application of the indulgences of the privileged altar, Masses of the dead should hitherto be celebrated *in nigris*, the Supreme

Pontiff has been pleased to grant said indulgences for the future, although the Mass of the feria be said with the *Oratio pro Defunctis*. In other ferias throughout the year not excepted in No. 2, as well as in semi-doubles, in days within non-privileged octaves and in simples, Masses of the dead as well as the other votive Masses can be said according to the Rubrics.

TITULUS XI.

On the Collects in Mass.

With reference to collects commanded by Ordinaries, they are henceforth forbidden (unless they be prescribed for some grave reason) not only on the vigils of the Nativity and of Pentecost and on doubles of the first class, but even on doubles of the second class, of the major Sundays within privileged octaves, and whenever in the Mass are to be said more than three *Orationes* prescribed on that day by the Rubrics.

TITULUS XII.

On Conventual Masses.

In churches in which there is the obligation of choir, only one Mass shall always be recited with the presence of the choir members and that of the office of the day, unless the Rubrics ordain otherwise; other Masses hitherto celebrated with the presence of the choir shall for the future be read *extra Chorum*, after the proper canonical hour; but exception from this rule is made for the Masses in *Litaniis majoribus et minoribus* and the Masses on the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord. So also exception is made for the Masses on the anniversaries of the creation and coronation of the Supreme Pontiff, of the election and consecration or translation of the Bishop, as well as on the anniversary of the latest deceased Bishop and of all the Bishops or Canons; and for all Masses *ex fundatione*.

TITULUS XIII.

On the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed.

1. On the commemoration of all the faithful departed the office and Mass of the current day are to be omitted and only the office and Mass of the Dead are to be said as is prescribed in the appendix of the new Psalter.

2. If on November 2 there occur a Sunday or a double of the first class the commemoration of the dead shall be celebrated on the first following day not similarly hindered; on which, should a double of the second class chance to occur, this is transferred according to the rule laid down in Titulus III., n. 3.

TEMPORARY PRESCRIPTIONS.

I. The calendars of every diocese or order or congregation using

the Roman Breviary for the year 1913 shall absolutely be drawn up according to the rules above set forth.

II. On Sundays on which in the calendars for the coming year 1912 are inscribed, under double rite major and minor, feasts of the saints, or of the angels, or even of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or an octave day of feasts other than those of our Lord, both the office in private recitation and the read Masses shall be *ad libitum*, either as is given in the calendar of the year 1912 or of the Sunday with commemoration of the double, major or minor. Also in the ferias, concerning which in Titulus X., n. 2, private Masses can be celebrated as is there noted.

III. What has been laid down in Titulus XIII. of these Rubrics with regard to the commemoration of all the faithful departed is to be put into application absolutely from the year 1912.

IV. Until the new correction of the Roman Breviary and Missal decreed by our Most Holy Lord be published:

(a) Perpetual calendars are not to be sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites for correction and approval;

(b) No petition is to be made to raise the degree of a rite or to introduce new feasts;

(c) As regards special feasts, either of the Blessed Virgin Mary or of saints or blessed, or double rite major or minor, assigned for Sundays, the local Ordinaries or the superiors of regulars are to prescribe that they be either commemorated in both Vespers, in Lauds and in the Mass, or provide, by presenting valid arguments to the Sacred Roman Congregation, for their transference to another day; or better they are to be omitted;

(d) No correction of the Rubrics having been made in the meanwhile, the rules above laid down are to be inserted in the new Breviaries and Missals after the General Rubrics, omitting the decrees of the S. R. C. hitherto inserted at the beginning of the Breviary;

(e) In future editions of the Breviary the following antiphons at Lauds are changed in consequence of the new reformation of the Breviary:

On Sexagesima Sunday: Ant. 5. In Excelsis* laudate Deum.

On the third Sunday of Lent: Ant. 3. Adhæsit anima mea* post te, Deus meus.

On the fourth Sunday of Lent: Ant. 4. Me suscepit* dextera tua, Domine.

On Thursday of Holy Week: Ant. 3. Tu autem, Domine* scis omne consilium eorum adversum me in mortem. Ant. 5. Fac, Domine,* judicium injuriam patientibus: et vias peccatorum disperde.

Book Reviews

THE CATECHIST; or, Headings and Suggestions for the Explanation of the Catechism of Christian Doctrine (No. 2). With Numerous Quotations and Examples from Scripture, and an Appendix of Anecdotes and Illustrations. By *Rev. George Edw. Howe*, author of "Sermon Plans." Sixth edition. Two vols., 8vo., pp. 658 and 680. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The following points and explanations, to which attention is respectfully invited, will show the aim and scope of the work:

1. At the outset it must be understood that "The Catechist" is in no sense a treatise on the Catechism. It is but a compilation, from various sources, of headings and points for explanation, suggestions made to the teacher, like so many pegs, whereon to hang developments of the text.

2. Hence brevity has been a chief aim in view, while it has also formed a chief difficulty, because of the danger of obscurity. Sentences are made short, without full grammatical expression, not merely for the sake of peace, but especially in order to concentrate the suggestions and make the whole appear, as far as possible, like a chart or map of ideas to the eye and memory of the catechist.

3. The publication is not intended to supersede all labor, but to put forth what may prove suggestive, and gather together, methodically and concisely, points under every question which the instructor may already know, but does not at the moment recall. It is hoped that this system of notes may save considerable time and trouble in reading up matter, without, however, dispensing with all need of preparation.

4. At the head of the various subjects references are given to works in which developments of the same may be found. It is by no means necessary to consult all these books; in most cases they are but repetitions of each other in different form; they are quoted here for the convenience of those who may possess them, or have one or two, and not the others. No reference, except for an occasional statement, is made to works of Theology, it being presumed that each one, according to need, will consult his own authors, whether in Dogma or Morals.

5. The references and quotations from Holy Scripture are very numerous, and it is hoped they will be found correct and exact. Experience shows how great is the inconvenience and the loss of time entailed by inaccuracy of reference, common in some books, especially in those printed abroad; every care, therefore, has been bestowed on this item. Yet with over 1,300 quotations, and more than 1,000 examples from Old and New Testaments, it may easily be that, in spite of all, some inaccuracy may have slipped in.

6. As to examples and illustrations: these also will be found very numerous, drawn from a variety of sources. At first, while the manuscript was progressing, mere references were made to the books from which they were taken. But it soon became evident that such a course must be useless to those who did not possess such books, or else involve them in considerable outlay if they wished to procure them. It was suggested, therefore, that the only plan to follow in this case would be to gather together all the examples into an Appendix and make all references to that. This idea has been followed up, as the only rational way out of the difficulty; it has, however, increased the size and consequent expense of this work, yet it will make it more complete in itself, and dispense with all need of the others.

7. As these anecdotes and examples have not to be *read* to the audience, they have usually been abbreviated and summarized, giving only the chief points of the story, which each one will enlarge and clothe as he deems best for the occasion. Some among them may appear somewhat trivial and unsuitable; but they are not all intended for all occasions. What might be considered as unbecoming the pulpit might be found suitable to the classroom; and what might seem childish and out of place with adults, interesting and in keeping in lessons given to children.

8. Besides the illustration given in the Appendix, over a thousand more are quoted from the different Books of Holy Scripture, for which references are given. These the catechist can interweave with the lesson, putting authoritative examples of vice or virtue in living form. This will not only add weight to his words, as well as lighten the instruction, but will also help to give to his hearers an outline of some of the chief events and personages in Holy Writ, of which perhaps there is too great ignorance nowadays. Thus Bible History will become truly the handmaid of the Catechism; the two should be used together.

9. Headings and ideas for explanation are given under all the answers of the textbook, and parts of answers, uniformity of treatment being aimed at. It will be admitted, however, that while some subjects are more important than others, they may also lend themselves more readily to development and have sometimes received more, which, while unnecessary in some circumstances, may be found useful in others. Any points considered too long and intricate for children's lessons may be shortened at discretion, and yet may prove useful for adult congregations or serve as points for sermons on the respective subjects.

10. Sundry items, not referred to in the Catechism itself, are here introduced, as closely related to those that are, and as of

advantage to be explained to the Faithful; an index of these will be found at the end, referring to the numbers of the questions to which they belong, or after which they will naturally find their place; *e. g.*, the Seal of Confession, never mentioned in the Catechism, should be treated of and will naturally come after the definition of Confession. Q. 295. Subjects directly spoken of in the text itself will not be referred to in the index, but must be sought for in their respective places, *e. g.*, *Purgatory*, under the Ninth Article of the Creed; *Anger*, under the Fifth Commandment.

II. A number of Saints' names are given throughout the work, without any explanation or reference; this simply means they are considered as examples of the virtue or subject then being treated of; details of such virtue will be found in their lives, under date of the feast day of each one as given.

The Catechist who uses this book will be well equipped and cannot fail for lack of material. But he must be willing to unite the various parts of his subject and supply the language for the presentation of the truths he wants to teach according to the capacity of his hearers. For such a one the book is well-nigh perfect. We cannot think of anything that it lacks.

FATHER LACOMBE: *The Black Robe Voyageur*. By *Katherine Hughes*, with a Preface by Sir William C. Van Horne. 8vo., pp. 467. Illustrated. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co.

The announcement says: This biographical story of Pere Lacombe is written from the standpoint of historical and human interest. It opens with pictures of life in old Quebec; from 1849 onward it deals mainly with the West.

The story of this remarkable man's life touches on St. Paul as a collection of log cabins, Fort Garry as a trading post, Fort Edmonton as the centre of the Saskatchewan and Athabasca fur trade, Calgary as a frontier police post, while in and out it winds through life on the Canadian plains as they evolve from Indian and Buffalo ranges to autonomous Provinces intercepted by railways. The subject—strong, humorous and dominant—passes with a great joy of life from one dramatic experience to another in the wilderness and on to the crowded life of big cities, where he still refuses to be commonplace. He is always a knight-errant of charity, a raconteur *par excellence*, a genius for friendship, a diplomat among diplomats. The book is a concise and human picture of the making of the West.

Archbishop Ireland says of Father Lacombe:

"He is one of the most remarkable men—decidedly the most remarkable priest—Western America has ever seen. His long

career as a missionary, beginning away back in 1849, continuing even unto our own days, and destined, we fondly hope, to continue into many years to come, has been a special gift of Providence to country and to Church, on account of his fruitful personal labors, and no less on account of the wholesome inspirations arising from it—bidding others to approximate, though they may not attain, the high ideal which he not only held before his mind, but which he actually realized in his own self. The love of God and of souls was throughout his career the dominant motive in all he thought, in all he did, in all he suffered. Co-operating with this, exalted and intensified with it, were the natural gifts rarely seen on such high planes of mind and heart—intelligence, practical sense, utter forgetfulness of self, utter good will in the service of others. Not only he willed much and planned much, but—a good fortune not always coming to most worthy ambitions—he accomplished much.

“As the apostle and civilizer of savage tribes, as the explorer of vast wildernesses, and the pathfinder of incoming new populations, he has been without an equal. His name is linked indissolubly with the early history of Western Canada as that of one of its most illustrious founders; his fame and the sweet odor of his apostolic zeal and good works should be made to spread over the whole continent of America.”

The author thus describes her method of gathering material for the book:

Father Lacombe’s peculiarly vivid intellect—which even yet seizes upon every detail in events and people that touch on his life—holds the past as in a mirror. To avail myself of this knowledge in securing quite accurate pictures of early Western periods and incidents, I have for some years submitted this venerable man month after month to what he laughingly termed “inquisitions.” Some others of the few Old-Timers remaining have likewise submitted to my “inquisitions,” and generously contributed to my knowledge of details.

This picture of Father Lacombe by one who saw him for the first time is worth reproducing:

“Near the Lake of the Woods at sunrise one morning in 1882 I saw a priest standing on a flat rock, his crucifix in his right hand and his broad hat in the other, silhouetted against the rising sun, which made a golden halo about him, talking to a group of Indians—men, women and papposes—who were listening with reverent attention. It was a scene never to be forgotten, and the noble and saintly countenance of the priest brought it to me that it must be Father Lacombe of whom I had heard so much; and it was.”

We feel that nothing more need be said to convince the reader

that we have here an important book. Subject, time, location, events—all combine to make it charming biography and valuable history.

HISTORY OF POPE BONIFACE VIII. AND HIS TIMES, WITH NOTES AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE. In six books. By *Don Louis Tosti*, Benedictine Monk of Monte Cassino. Translated from the Italian by Right Rev. Mgr. Eugene J. Donnelly, V. F., Pastor of St. Michael's Church, Flushing, Long Island. 8vo., pp. 546. New York: Christian Press Association.

The translator's preface makes the best introduction for this book. He says: "A backward glance through the history of the Middle Ages may show us not a few majestic figures among the Popes, but none so striking and remarkable as that of Boniface VIII. Surrounded by stern and simple times, he appeals to us with peculiar directness because of the almost universal and lasting denunciation of historians, both of his own and later times. The history of the Church during these times is wholly a history of the struggle of the Papacy against the supremacy of the Imperial power. Some Popes more than others are distinguished for the bold resistance they showed to this unjust assumption and strove to maintain the rights of the Church, among whom are to be particularly mentioned Alexander III., Gregory VII., Innocent III. and Boniface VIII.

"Pope Boniface VIII. deserves to be called the last Pope of the Middle Ages. It was during his Pontificate that the temporal power of the Holy See was, for the first time, attacked by France, and the prestige of the Papacy was subjected to the most violent outrages. He was a great mediæval Pope. His figure can be justly compared with that of Innocent III. or Gregory IX. Like them, he solemnly affirmed the Pontifical authority; like them, he fought princes with a stubbornness which alone equaled the consciousness he had of his own rights. By his sumptuous ceremonies, by his striking and eloquent Bulls, he manifested to the world the grandeur and power of the Papacy. The Pontificate of Boniface VIII. is the beginning of a transition period; it exhibits the sinking of the Papal power and the rising of the secular State-idea hostile to the Church. The subordination of the secular under the spiritual order was denied. The See of Peter was shaken, but not destroyed.

"The chief reproaches that are brought against Boniface VIII. relate to the abdication of Celestine V.; his own election to the Papacy; the imprisonment of Celestine V.; the quarrel that arose between him and the Colonna family, and Philip the Fair. But all these charges will be met and explained to the reader during his perusal of this history. Moreover, the moral portraits of Boniface and Philip the Fair being traced, there is no doubt that ap-

proaching them nearer in order to observe their conduct in the famous quarrel, the truth will be seen more plainly and more easily."

A justification for the translation of Tosti's *Life of Boniface* is found in these words:

"But he has found some apologists and defenders, and among them the first place is to be given to the celebrated Benedictine of Monte Cassino, Dom Louis Tosti. This historian is among the foremost of Italy whose various works have been favorably received everywhere, and have made him renowned for splendid historical attainments. His work, 'The Life and Times of Boniface VIII.,' which we present to the public in an English dress, is an admirable and effective defense of that Pope.

"In it he breathes the true spirit of a historian; he neither apologizes nor does he advance a proof without producing documentary evidence from the most approved sources. In the compilation of this work Tosti had access to many unpublished documents in the Vatican Archives, and to have drawn from them much information of the greatest value."

Monsignor Donnelly's knowledge of the Italian tongue, acquired by years of residence in Rome, and supplemented by years of study, together with his well-known ability and scholarly attainments, fit him unusually well to act as translator for so distinguished an author and so important a subject. The book is very valuable.

PRIMITIVE CATHOLICISM. By *Monsignor Battifol, Litt. D.* Translated by Henri L. Brianceau, of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, from the fifth French edition of "*L'Eglise Naissante.*" Revised by the author. 8vo., pp. 424. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"The subject I am proposing to treat, and which, if God permit, I intend at some future day to pursue down to the epoch of St. Augustine and St. Leo, is the history of the formation of Catholicism, that is to say, of the Church in so far as it is a visible, universal society, built upon the framework of a rule of faith and a hierarchy.

"In the present volume on 'Primitive Catholicism' I study the origins of this formation, taking the time of St. Cyprian as the term of these origins. It might indeed be contended that their real term was reached more than half a century before his time, but his writings and the discussions in which he took a leading part show so clearly that the doctrines and institutions of Catholicism were then generally accepted, and, on the other hand, the historical continuity that had governed the development of these doctrines and institutions up to his day, makes itself so sensibly felt in these same writings that they complete for us in an admirable

manner the knowledge we are able to acquire of the two hundred years of previous Christianity.

We must confess, however, that it is not without some timidity we approach the study of these two centuries of primitive history, seeing that the documentary evidence, abundant as it is, gives us but a faint idea of the early Christian life, so varied, so complex, so deep! How much light we should be deprived of had not the epistles of St. Ignatius and the Apologies of St. Justin been preserved!"

This is one of the really important books of the year. At a time when men are more divided than ever before on the subject of religion, when these divisions are producing the inevitable result of driving men away from religion altogether, and when the thinking Protestant world is praying for and striving for union, how consoling for the Catholic and how startling for the Protestant to hear a man of Monsignor Battifol's scholarly attainments and acknowledged ability lay down the thesis, "Christianity was born Catholic, for there is identity of structure between apostolic Christianity and the Christianity of about the year 200."

How well he has succeeded in proving it we may learn on the testimony of Professor Harnack, to which the author himself appeals. Harnack says: "The author has rendered to his Church a most signal service, for one could not undertake with greater special knowledge of the subject to establish the original identity of Christianity, Catholicism and the Roman primacy. He does not seek to prove his thesis by means of metahistoric speculation which does not concern itself with the chronology of events, but confines himself to the territory of facts and their consequences, and seeks to furnish a truly historical demonstration. That *Roman* and *Catholic* are identical I proved as a Protestant historian some twenty years ago, in my 'History of Dogma,' though with certain reserves which the author strives, of course, to discard in most cases." Professor Harnack earnestly recommends those Protestants who are interested in the history of the Church not to overlook this work, but to study it thoroughly. We believe that we may safely offer the same recommendation to Catholics. The result will be knowledge, and an increase of faith, hope and charity.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XII., Philip—Revalidation. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

As this master work draws near to completion one is tempted to think that the feature of its making which will excite most

wonder in the future is the remarkable promptness that marked its progress from beginning to end. We use the word promptness and not haste, because the former is a virtue and the latter may be a vice. There is no mark of haste about the book. But when we consider that the editorial staff was formed for this purpose without any experience of this kind as a body, and perhaps even as individuals; that the publishing organization came into existence for this special work; that the financial plan had to be evolved and perfected; that the world had to be searched for contributors, whose merits had to be weighed and whose previous work had to be examined in order that the best might be selected for each particular subject, the wonder grows that so very much has been so well nigh perfectly accomplished in so short a time.

The comprehensiveness of the work is becoming more strikingly apparent as the end draws near. Of course, every one knows that there is no perfectly comprehensive encyclopedia in the strict sense of the work, as there is no perfect university, and therefore it is not surprising to hear some reader say that he has been disappointed when he consulted the book or to read that some reviewer has noticed the absence of one or two subjects.

Probably all thinking men will agree that the encyclopedia which contains all the subjects which by common consent should be included, treated as fully as possible, with due allowance for their relative importance, may truthfully be said to be comprehensive. We must remember that there may be a difference of opinion as to the subjects that ought to be treated, and even the most careful editing may overlook something that is entitled to a place. With this understanding, it must be admitted that the Catholic Encyclopedia is a remarkably comprehensive book, and that it will really be a Catholic library in itself.

The importance of the work has been strongly emphasized recently, when a new edition of the largest and most important of the secular encyclopedias came from the press. The editors and managers laid special stress on the fairness with which they intended to treat Catholic subjects, and made a special bid for Catholic patronage. Alas, how far short of the promise was the reality! It has been shown that it is so unfair, so unreliable, as to be unworthy of encouragement and unsafe for reading. This confirms what experience had already shown, that a Catholic encyclopedia is strictly necessary for Catholic students, and indeed for all students, whether Jew, Gentile or pagan, who want the truth about the Catholic Church.

To speak of the importance of the subjects in the twelfth volume is but to repeat what has been said of each of the preceding vol-

umes. Each one seems most important until the next one appears. The truth is it is impossible to make a comparison. Every volume has a value all its own, and each one is a unit of a series that when complete will be invaluable.

OTHER SHEEP I HAVE. By *Theodore Christian*. The Proceedings of the Celestial Commission of Church Unity. 8vo., pp. 385. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"This volume is written in the interest of church union. In a discussion that the author represents as being held before a heavenly moderator, the beliefs of the several denominations of the Christian Church are subjected to a critical analysis, and compromises, where possible, are suggested. The author has spared no effort to present, in all its phases, the complicated and important subject to which he has devoted his attention for a long period of years."

The author represents himself as taken up into the seventh heaven somewhat after the manner of St. Paul, and there seeing a messenger appointed by the Supreme Being to go down to earth in answer to the prayers which have been sent up to heaven for church unity. The messenger comes down accompanied by the author and by Peace and Charity, and the investigation begins. Representatives of all the churches appear, and try to sustain their own claims while discrediting the claims of others. The various virtues appear, personified, and try to preserve peace and bring about unity.

Although the opinions expressed and arguments used seem to be those of imaginary persons, they are not so, but are quotations from actual, well-known individuals. Concerning this the author says:

"In the following pages certain opinions expressed by imaginary characters in the work are really the opinions of learned authorities in the churches represented by the speakers, or of persons of the type of character depicted, credit for which is given by footnotes. These have not been put in quotation marks, in order to give the impression that the words emanate from the character who utters them, that the continuity of the story may not be interrupted and that the reader may not be confused. Some of these quotations are in the exact words of the original."

The whole thing is ingeniously done, but one might reasonably ask at the end, *cui bono*? While the author does not draw any final conclusions from the discussion, he seems to think that church unity is neither possible nor necessary. He closes with this prescription for this disunion which the Doctor has prescribed, which the Moderator had placed in the custody of Charity, and which the latter charged the author to read on earth and make public:

"Of May (not Must) a great deal.

"Of Moderation (not Excess) the proper amount.

"Of Inclusiveness (not Exclusiveness) a sufficient quantity.

"Of Love (of first purity, if you are fortunate enough to find it), more than all combined.

"Apply personally, in these proper proportions, and gradually."

We are quite sure that every one who has ever thought of church unity at all will claim that he has been using this prescription from the beginning, and yet the child is as sick as ever. *Cui bono?*

THE CRUX OF PASTORAL MEDICINE. *The Perils of Embryotic Man.* By Rev. Andrew Klarmann, A. M. Fourth enlarged edition. 12mo., pp. 283. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

It is surely a healthy sign of the times that a book like this, treating of a subject which should interest all men, on which all should agree and which lies at the very deepest foundations of society, has in so short a time reached a fourth edition. Unfortunately, society generally has gone far astray on this subject, and even to get men to consider at all the orthodox view of the law of God and the law of nature, which regulate the whole subject and which are as clear as crystal, is much to be thankful for. As has been well said by the author:

"There is no more burning question at the present time than the one which has called forth this book. The future of society, the future of the nation depend on the right understanding and the faithful observance of God's holy fundamental laws on the relations of the sexes and the generation of the human race. No nation can prosper that violates these laws, and the individuals that compose it bring upon themselves misery here and hereafter. The warnings against race suicide are becoming louder every day, and laws that prevent it in its more flagrant forms are being more strictly enforced in all well-regulated communities, but something more is needed to stay the blighting evil. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the further we get away from that wholesome fear the nearer we draw to the precipice.

Our greatest hope for the correction of this evil lies with the doctors. We abstract, of course, from spiritual aid, and consider the physician not only as a healer of the body, but as a teacher of right ethics. If we can get our physicians to understand the enormous responsibility that rests on them in shaping the morals of their patients while treating their bodies, we shall have made long strides forward in this battle with sin in its worst form."

In this, the fourth edition, three new chapters have been added, which elucidate, with equal brevity and thoroughness, the three most

modern and urgent questions of this subject, recently discussed with much spirit by professional champions on both sides. The author summarizes the results of these discussions and tests them on the edge of logic and philosophy.

We cheerfully repeat what we said about the first edition:

"The work is brief and to the point, and it deals with very important questions in a clear, straightforward manner. What is still better, it answers those questions. We have frequently heard conscientious physicians and medical students inquire for some brief work of this kind, and we hope that the present work will find its way into their hands."

SOCIAL FRANCE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By *Cécile Hugon*, Sometime Scholar of Somerville College, Oxford. With twelve illustrations. 8vo., pp. 321. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.

The author thus introduces the subject: "The seventeenth century is a peculiarly baffling one, because it appears on the surface so simple. It is simple because the *Memoires* dealing with the upper classes are as excellent as they are numerous; it is difficult to understand because the peasant and the tradesman of the period Vatican Archives, and has drawn from them much information about themselves.

"'L'état, c'est moi,' is a truism which has become a household word; but a too ready acceptance of it as a truth places the student on the wrong road at the very outset of his pilgrimage. Never was a more heterogeneous collection of ideals, precepts and codes of morals presented for the acceptance of a nation than at this time. Never did nation comport itself in a more interesting manner than the French while engaged in the process of selection and of coördinating the matter selected. Hence it follows that the subject of this book is a very wide one, and I cannot claim to have dealt with even one section of it in full. The only aim of this sketch has been to represent the general aspect of the century in a few rough strokes, here and there filled in, but more often left bare.

"It deals chiefly with the minor ideals and hopes of mankind which form the principal difference between one age and another. We share the larger ambitions of our fathers, but we do not enjoy the same things. The political history of the period is so complicated, and at the same time so closely bound up with the domestic life of the nation, that a brief historical introduction appeared necessary. This summary of political events is only meant to serve as a help to the understanding of social conditions otherwise, perhaps, unintelligible."

Then follows the Introduction, to which fifteen pages are given.

Larger space is naturally given to the distinguished women who gathered about the Court of Louis XIV. and became more or less prominent during his reign. History shows that they were worldly and frivolous in many cases to a shocking degree, and yet that they possessed great strength of character when put to the test in time of pestilence.

If the sketches of the people in general and their everyday life are briefer, they are not less interesting or complete, and are brought out with sufficient clearness to perfect the picture.

The book is splendidly made, and both author and publisher are to be congratulated.

EPITOME E GRADUALI S. R. E. De Tempore et De Sanctis. SS. D. N. PII X. Pontificis Maximi jussu Restituto et Editio. Cui addita sunt Fasta Novissima. Editio Ratisbonensis juxta Vaticanam. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

It is always a pleasure to take up the liturgical publications of the house of Pustet and to bring them to the attention of others. Their knowledge, their experience, their equipment, their good taste and their sense of responsibility—all guarantee the best in every sense of the word. It is probably more true of liturgical books than of any other class of publications that those who use them depend almost entirely on the publishers. The technical knowledge required to make them and to test them is possessed by a few persons only, and unless the publishers are thoroughly reliable and conscientious, the liturgy of the Church will fail of its purpose.

The book before us is a splendid example of the right way, and its adoption and use will ensure correctness and edification in the conduct of the church service.

PRACTICAL HANDBOOK FOR THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE AND OF BIBLE LITERATURE. By *Dr. Michael Selsenger*, Professor at the Royal Lyceum at Freising. Translated from the sixth German edition by A. M. Buchanan, M. A., and edited by the Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard. With maps and illustrations. One volume, large octavo, cloth, net, \$2.00. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

By way of introduction: "This book is offered to the English-speaking people as a small contribution towards the realization of the great and noble aims of the reigning Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius X. The heroic stand which he has made for the preservation of the Word of God commands at once the sympathy and admiration of all the faithful. Just as in the realm of philosophy he has insisted on the true personality and dignity of a man, and as in theology on the true transcendence and majesty of God, so also has he in the realm of Biblical science insisted on the divine char-

acter of the inspired Word. . . . A translation of Dr. Seisenberger's work has been asked for, as providing a bird's-eye view of the Biblical question from the Catholic standpoint, suitable to the exigencies of the present day. It is a handbook for the hard-worked parochial clergy. It is an introduction for the seminary student. Yet, although it is merely a synopsis, it is enriched on every page with ample references to the more specialized works—a detailed list of which is appended to the book—so that the reader who wishes to pursue any given subject more deeply has the material at hand without further search."

It is hard to imagine a more excellent book of its kind, and its importance is unquestionable. Our Biblical literature is not nearly full enough, and we have had to depend entirely too much on non-Catholic authors for information on Biblical subjects. We shall not have to do so any longer in this particular respect, for Dr. Seisenberger's Handbook is comprehensive, clear, accurate and interesting. It will abundantly satisfy every demand for a work of this kind.

NEW BREVIARIES.
NEW PSALTER.

Since the revisions of the Breviary all clerics are interested in publishers' announcements concerning new editions. It is true that the new order does not oblige until 1913, but as each individual is free to adopt it at once if he wishes, there is a general desire to know just what the new order means in practice. As far as we know, the only new breviaries and psalters printed so far have come from the Vatican, and even these have not been on sale in this country. The only other positive announcements that we have seen have been made by the Society of St. John in Belgium and by the Mechlin publishers. We are informed by B. Herder, of Freiburg and St. Louis, that he is not prepared to announce new editions at present, but that he is now taking orders for the publications of the Society of St. John and Dessain, of Mechlin, to be filled very soon.

Benziger Brothers also announce the publications of the same houses, and are receiving orders to be filled at the earliest possible moment.

Fr. Pustet & Co. do not announce new editions of their own, but they are also receiving orders for the other publications. They announce the New Vatican Psalter at \$1, and as it is possible to use any Breviary with the new Psalter as a key, they offer twenty per cent. discount on all Breviaries and present a copy of the Psalter to each purchaser. "The Ecclesiastical Review" announces that it hopes to print the new Ordo in its March number.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII. --APRIL, 1912 --No. 146.

A WORD ON TROUBLED PARAGUAY.

RUMORS of war are once more floating to us from the Southern Hemisphere, at a time when we had begun to hope that revolution was a thing of the past in South America. South America has reached a period of increasing prosperity, and the eyes of the world are turned upon her as upon a storehouse wherein nature has deposited her choicest treasures. It is indeed a pity that just at this time of awakening interest several of those favored countries should again be given up to internecine strife.

In the past South America has known by the bitterest of experiences what revolution is; she has drunk the cup of blood to its dregs. Not one of her republics has escaped the baneful influences of civil war.

Until late in the nineteenth century there was one exception, and that exception was Paraguay, the garden spot of South America, a country which, I am sure, is still destined for great things. We therefore cannot but feel regret when, together with rumors of fighting in Brazil and in Ecuador, we read that Paraguay is now in the throes of something like a revolution.

Paraguay is the earliest seat of civilization in the regions of the La Plata. Discovered by Sebastian Cabot in 1525, though Solis had sailed up the La Plata as early as 1516, Paraguay was conquered in 1536 by Juan de Ayolas, who in the same year founded Asuncion many years before the foundations of the city of Buenos Aires were laid. Asuncion became the headquarters of the Spanish Gov-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912 by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ernment east of the Cordilleras, extending its dominion over all the La Plata country, including the western district of Tucuman to the slopes of the Andes.

Toward the close of the sixteenth century Fernando Arias, the Governor, who was a native of the country, introduced the Jesuits. Gradually these good fathers converted and civilized the Indians, gathering them into communities. The Paraguay Reductions became famous in history. The rule of the Jesuits was paternal, it is true, and their government more or less absolute, or theocratic, if you like, but the Indians were benefited. Agriculture flourished, great works were undertaken, and even the fine arts were cultivated. Everything seemed peaceable and happy until the Paulistas from Brazil swooped down upon the missions and almost ruined them. Immense numbers of the unfortunate neophytes were carried off to Brazil as slaves. This was in the seventeenth century. However, the Jesuits, nothing daunted, moved down the Paraná with the remnants of their flock and established a new Christian republic, with a number of agricultural and industrial settlements. Each colony was established on a uniform plan, with a plaza in the centre, where the church, college, arsenal and workshop stood. Regularity prevailed and religious services were performed daily. In 1740 the total population of the Jesuit Reductions was estimated at more than 140,000 souls.

Then came the final blow, the machinations of the enemies of the society prevailed and the Jesuits were mercilessly driven out of the Portuguese and Spanish possessions, as they were expelled from the mother countries. The missions went to pieces, and in 1801 only 43,639 survivors could be found who had lived under the paternal rule of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

The name of the society is to-day written all over South America. It is impossible to travel over Northern Argentina and Paraguay without finding memories of the Jesuits at every step. From the great basin of the Amazon north, from the town of Auchiela, in Northern Brazil, to the Cathedral of Bahia, with its memorial tablet to Father Antonio Vieira, down to the Province of Mendoza and the Territory of Neuquen, in Argentina, everywhere you meet with the Jesuits. Paraguay and the Territory of Misiones, in the Argentine Republic, are actually covered with the ruins of the Jesuit missions, and wherever you go in Corrientes, in Tucuman, in Buenos Aires, you find the Jesuits again and again.

The enemies of the society have pointed to the fact that the Jesuit labors were so soon dissolved as a proof of their lack of solidity, and at the International Congress of Americanists at Buenos Aires an acrimonious discussion on this subject was pre-

precipitated by a modern explorer in Paraguay. We must, however, not forget that it is with man, as it is with the tropical soil. Leave a plantation in the tropics six months without cultivation and it grows up into a wilderness. Take away priests and spiritual advisers from a parish for ten years and see what will happen. No! the return to savagery of the Paraguay Indians must not be imputed to the Jesuits. If blame is to be attached to any one, then turn over the pages of history to find the names of Pombal and Arana.

Shortly after the expulsion of the Jesuits the La Plata countries were separated from the jurisdiction of the Viceroy of Peru and constituted into a separate viceroyalty, with Buenos Aires as the head. At the period of the revolution that swept over Spanish America in the beginning of the nineteenth century Paraguay obtained its independence, in spite of the efforts of Buenos Aires to annex it. In the course of its history as a republic Paraguay has been, to a great extent and for many long years under despotic government, ruled by the mighty hand of a dictator.

First there was Francia, whose policy was one of isolation and who kept foreigners out of the country. Of course, under such conditions there was no question of progress. Francia's absolute rule ended with his death in 1840. He was followed by Carlos Antonio Lopez, another dictator, under whom the country enjoyed a Constitution, at least in name. Lopez, it must be said to his credit, did much for the welfare of the country. In 1859 he began the Central Railway, that now extends from Asuncion to the borders of Argentina, thus far the only railway in the republic.

In 1862 Carlos A. Lopez was succeeded by his son, the famous Francisco Solano Lopez, who also labored to some extent for the material welfare of the country, though he ruled it with absolute power. Still, up to his time Paraguay had been in peace, and it had been spared the horrors of bloodshed through which the other republics had passed.

But its day came when Lopez, alienating his friends across the line, precipitated a frightful war by attacking Argentina. Now began the most bloody war ever waged in South America. Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina combined against the little republic, and a death struggle ensued. The quiet, simple, pleasure-loving, holiday-making, flowery Paraguayans gave to the world the example of a people struggling for their existence with undaunted heroism. The Paraguayans were fighters, indeed. Lopez himself fell dead upon the field of battle rather than surrender to the enemy. The war ended with his death in 1870.

Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina had agreed in 1865 to respect the sovereignty of Paraguay for five years, and after the war its in-

dependence continued, preserved by the balance of power which is still its safeguard.

Unfortunately, the country was ruined and the male population killed off. Even to-day there is an immense preponderance of the female element.

The area of the republic is 171,815 square miles, but the population is only 4.6 to the square mile, or 800,000. The climate, sub-tropical, is delightful, with an undulating country, watered by large streams. There are in Paraguay as many inducements to immigrants as in almost any South American country, and yet immigration has been a negligible quantity, although there are several small colonies of foreigners. This beautiful land of flowers and of oranges possesses immense agricultural resources, while there are great opportunities for pastoral industries. The total foreign commerce is on the increase, and though at my latest information the imports still exceeded the exports, this may partly be explained by the great importation of rolling stock and material for the completion of the Central Railway.

Paraguay has few industries, though, as I have indicated, the possibilities of its resources are very great. All tropical products may be cultivated in Paraguay. Tobacco is one of the leading crops, but the cultivation of sugar, coffee, rice, mandioca, yerba maté (the Paraguayan tea) and cotton are promising. Cotton raising possesses immense possibilities, with a large yield per acre and the good reputation that the Paraguayan cotton possesses.

One of the most important industries is the preparation of the oil of petit grain, an extract from the leaves of a native orange tree, used as a basis for perfumes and flavoring extracts.

Another industry is lace making. Paraguayan lace stands eminent to-day, not only for the delicate quality of the work, but also for the variety and beauty of the patterns.

The cattle industry is increasing, and in recent years many cattlemen from Argentina and Brazil have settled in Paraguay. It is estimated that there are over 5,000,000 cattle of all kinds in the republic.

The capital of Paraguay is Asuncion, on the east bank of the Paraguay River, at a distance of 970 miles from Buenos Aires. Its population is 80,000. A great portion of the city has been completely modernized, with wide and well-paved streets, illuminated by electricity.

Asuncion is regarded as one of the most picturesque cities of the New World. From the eminence where it is seated the vision extends over the river and beyond to the immense forest regions of the Chaco. Three beautiful avenues, Colon, España and Asun-

cion, bordered by villas, add their charm to the eye. Three lines of tramways unite the centre of the city with the outlying districts and the suburbs, while a steam tramway runs to San Lorenzo, with its fashionable country residences. Is it not a pity that blood should now be flowing in these streets?

Asuncion has good hotels, fine shops and stores, several banking establishments and fine public buildings. Prominent among these are the Government palace, the Cathedral, the theatre and the railway station. The massive Government building was formerly the palace of the dictator Lopez.

The early morning hours in Asuncion are of especial interest, for business begins early. The market is teeming with activity and the Guarani women, smoking their cigars and exhibiting their wares, add a touch of the picturesque to the scene. From 11 to 2 business is suspended under the burning rays of the sun, but in the afternoon life begins again, and the women and girls are once more in evidence.

The national archives of Paraguay are among the most important of South America, and they will be invaluable to the historian of the future, in spite of the losses they have suffered. They have been rearranged, in 6,241 volumes, with documents of all kinds, 525 being historical and some going back to 1534. The "Biblioteca Americana," founded by Senor Godoi, is one of the finest collections of Americana, with 15,000 volumes. The collection of old American newspapers is perhaps the most remarkable of its kind.

The Museum of the Fine Arts in Asuncion possesses some excellent paintings that would figure anywhere with honor, and an academy of design, painting and sculpture offers a permanent exposition of national art to the public. Connected with the Museum of the Fine Arts is the Historical Museum, with a fine collection of arms, banners and portraits.

I have merely given a glimpse of the beautiful city on the Paraguay, but enough to cause regret for anything like strife that might retard its progress.

Asuncion is the see of a Bishop, suffragan to the Archbishop of Buenos Aires. This diocese is the oldest in the La Plata countries, having been founded by Pope Paul III. in 1547.

One of the finest temples in the republic is the one known as the "Oratorio of the Virgin of Asuncion." It was begun some years ago, and recently the Department of Public Works has called for bids to complete it. This church is noted for the beauty of its architecture.

As in other countries of South America, Church and State are united in Paraguay, for according to the Constitution the Roman

Catholic religion is that of the country, though Congress may not prohibit the exercise of other forms of worship.

Besides Asuncion, there are a number of smaller towns and settlements scattered throughout the republic, especially in the western portion of the country, toward the Paraguay, many of them dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The second city of the republic is Villa Rica, with a population exceeding 28,000. It is connected by the Central Railway with Asuncion. The town dates from 1566. Situated on an eminence, it is most picturesque and healthy; in fact, a health resort. Numerous invalids from Montevideo, Buenos Aires and other places on the Rio de la Plata flock to it in quest of pure air. It is also of considerable commercial importance.

The old Jesuit church and college that existed well into the nineteenth century were destroyed by the Dictator Francia.

Quite a number of towns are located on the Paraguay, being thus accessible by water. For instance, there is Humaita, that during the great war was the bulwark of Paraguay, bidding defiance to the invaders. Lopez had a chain across the river, but in June, 1868, a very high flood enabled the Brazilian warships to force a passage upward.

The next town, Villa del Pilar, formerly Neembucer, was the only place in Francia's time where foreign merchants were permitted to trade. Further up the Paraguay, beyond Asuncion, lies Concepción, an old town founded in 1622. Having suffered greatly in the war, it had only 2,000 inhabitants in 1892. Since then its progress has been exceedingly rapid, and it is now the third city of the republic, with a population of about 16,000. Concepcion is the centre of a flourishing cattle trade and the headquarters of the commerce of the Upper Paraguay, as well as of the State of Matto Grosso, in Brazil.

Further north, the Aquidaban River empties into the Paraguay. It was on the banks of this stream that Lopez and his son, Pancho, fell fighting to the last. The Aquidaban is only one of many rivers that flow down from the highlands of the west to the Paraguay.

The great region of the Gran Chaco west of the river is inhabited by uncivilized Indian tribes. This territory is partly claimed by Paraguay and partly by Bolivia. The Paraguayan Chaco may contain some 30,000 or more Indians. As a rule, the Chaco Indians are unwarlike. Prominent among the tribes are the Lenguas, one of the most numerous and a peaceable and naturally industrious people. There is a Protestant mission among them. The needs of the South American Indians are very great spiritually. It is indeed sad to reflect that after all the early labors of the missionaries

there is still so much to be done; but alas! the harvest is immense, but the laborers are few. At the present time the Franciscans, the Capuchins, the Fathers of Don Bosco and others are prominent in the work of evangelizing the natives in the more southern portion of the South American continent or in Argentina and Chile. In South America, as in North America, the Indian is doomed to extinction as the white man advances step by step. Contact with civilization seems fatal to him.

Asuncion may be reached by water from Buenos Aires at least by three lines of steamers, steamers that are quite well equipped and elegantly fitted up. The first line is that of the Lloyd Brasileiro, a Brazilian company that run their ships to New York and the West Indies, up the Amazon and along the coast. The particular line going to Asuncion is that of the Upper Paraguay. It proceeds from Rosario, in Argentina, stopping at a number of Argentine ports before reaching Asuncion. The journey from Buenos Aires to Asuncion lasts about five days. From Asuncion steamers of this line continue up the Paraguay to Cuyabá, the capital of the State of Matto Grosso, in Brazil.

The second line is that of Mihanovich, leaving Buenos Aires for Asuncion about three times a week. Finally, the line of Amadeo F. Nunez connects Buenos Aires with Asuncion four times a month.

Until recently one might travel to Asuncion only part of the way by rail, but to-day you may proceed all the way by railroad and reach Asuncion in less than two days. The Paraguay Central Railroad has been extended to Villa Encarnacion, on the Upper Paraná, and the Argentine railway, the Argentine Northeastern, has reached Posadas, on the south bank, opposite Villa Encarnacion. A ferry plies across the river connecting the two roads, and thus Buenos Aires and Asuncion are now linked together by the way of iron.

A very important railway that is projected will run from Asuncion across the republic eastward into Brazil to the port of S. Francisco, and thus bring Asuncion in direct communication with the Atlantic. A portion of the Brazilian section of this road has already been completed.

In course of time this railway will be extended westward from Asuncion across the Paraguay and the territory of Gran Chaco, through Bolivia and Northern Chile to the Pacific coast. The Atlantic and Pacific are now united by four connecting lines between Buenos Aires and Valparaiso, namely, the Pacific line from Buenos Aires to Mendoza, the Argentine Transandean from Mendoza up the Andes to Las Cuevas, the Chilean Transandean from Las Cuevas through the tunnel and down the Andes to Santa Rosa de los Andes

and the Chilean Railway from Los Andes to Valparaiso. By means of the Trans-Paraguayan railway the coast of Brazil will be brought into direct railway communication with the Pacific coast of Chile. It goes without saying that such a railway will exercise an immense influence over Paraguay and open it to the world.

All that Paraguay now needs is a stable government and a good, healthy immigration. She has the resources that are awaiting exploitation through capital and labor, but without a stable and responsible government neither capital nor labor will avail much.

In her new Constitution, drawn up after the great war, Paraguay declared against dictatorship and seemed determined to be done with it forever, yet it would seem that the spirit of dictatorship is still in the air. What the present trouble amounts to it is hard to understand. Difficulty seems to have been brewing for a considerable time. Up to last July the Presidential chair was occupied by a provisional President in the person of Colonel Albino Gara. On the resignation of Gara on the 5th of the month the Congress appointed Senor Liberato M. Rojas to act as Provisional President until November 25, 1911. On September 30, however, the legislative body voted to prolong the term of Rojas as Provisional President until 1914; in other words, throughout the whole constitutional term. The present insurrection is against the government of Rojas, whose person has been captured by the revolutionaries. New developments are taking place every day.

Argentine and Brazil, as the great powers of South America, to some extent responsible for Paraguay, are interfering, it is said, and sending their gunboats up the river, as we send our warships to the scene of trouble, as we have them now on the yellow fever infected coast of Ecuador, where other troubles are in progress. It remains to be seen what influence Brazil and Argentina will exercise. The countries most interested in Paraguay, owing to their proximity to it, are Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Bolivia—Brazil and Argentina are, of course, the most important factors. They are commercial rivals, and one has not to be a great political economist to infer that they must needs be political rivals. Which of them will become the dominant factor in South American politics?

Brazil has the larger territory, the greater population and a greater variety of resources, with less of the foreign element than Argentina. But there is much Negro blood in Brazil, together with a torrid climate. Besides, it would seem from recent reports that Brazil has troubles of her own at home just now.

Argentina, on the other hand, has the commerce, the wealth, the energy, an efficient army and a splendid navy. Her population is largely of foreign extraction, but it is fervid with patriotism and

the children of foreigners are Argentinians to the backbone. Brazil and Argentina, in consequence of this rivalry, are not overmuch in love with each other, though there may be many professions of friendship and though an A, B, C Triple Alliance exist between Argentina, Brazil and Chile. But it is precisely by this rivalry that the independence of Uruguay and Paraguay is safeguarded. Neither of these countries need fear an attack from its powerful neighbors, one of whom would hesitate to attempt anything like annexation for fear of the other. Thus the balance of power is preserved.

A solution of the problem and a guarantee of peace in Paraguay would be a treaty between Brazil and Argentina, the powers most interested, leaving Uruguay and Bolivia out of the question, by which the independence of Paraguay would be guaranteed, with a possible intervention for the common good in cases like the present.

Paraguay, unlike Argentina and Brazil, that possess a federal form of government, is a centralized republic. The President and the Vice President are elected for a term of four years, the former drawing a salary of \$7,000 per annum. The President's Cabinet consists of the Ministers of the Interior, Treasury, War, Foreign Relations and of Justice, Worship and Public Instruction.

The National Congress consists of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, the members of which are elected by direct popular vote, all citizens over eighteen years being entitled to the right of suffrage. Congress meets yearly from April 1 to August 31.

The standing army of Paraguay counts only 2,600 officers and men, but all citizens between the ages of twenty and thirty-five are liable to service in the National Guard. The republic has practically no navy, unless its dispatch boat and couple of transports might be dignified by that name.

Primary education is obligatory. In 1910 there were about 500 schools, with 43,000 pupils, in the country. For higher education there exist a university, with faculties of law and medicine, several national colleges and a diocesan seminary, besides schools of agriculture, music, design, mechanical engineering, languages and so forth. The republic has also its military academy.

There is no doubt that with its fine climate, its splendid resources, its beauty of vegetation and its magnificent waterways, Paraguay might in course of time become a very flourishing republic and an agreeable country to live in.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

THOUGHTS NEW AND OLD ABOUT JUSTICE.

IN THE letter of Pope St. Clement to the Corinthians (c. v.) St. Paul is described as "preaching Justice all over the world;" and the Apostle himself in his four epistles, written respectively to Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, used the same word in its different modifications about two hundred times. It means in his mouth the supernatural life of grace; and about that we have nothing further to say in the present discussion, though in itself it is very important, being the purpose of Christ's mission. Under the distress of much keenly felt wrongfulness prophet and psalmist had long cried for some leader to set the people right. Thus Jeremias in his inspired vision looked beyond the mere bringer-back from the Babylonian captivity when he spoke the words, "Behold, I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall do justice and judgment upon earth, and His name shall be the Lord our Justice" (xxii., 5, 6). This idea pervades the Old Testament, which also (Josue x., 13) quotes an extra canonical "Book of Jasher," the "Just One."

Another meaning of Justice not to our present purpose lies in the use of it to signify all virtue under its common aspect of righteousness. "It is not a single division of virtue," says Aristotle, "but the whole of virtue." ("Eth. Nic.," V. III.) In this sense the just man is the perfect man; to fulfill all justice is to perform all duty and even more.¹

A third signification to be set aside is that of Plato when he makes Justice mean individually the perfect adjustment of all man's parts in one whole and socially the perfect adjustment of all the individuals in the civil state, so that each serves in his own peculiar way the common weal. No part should interfere with or oppose another part; each man should mind his own concerns and not meddle with those of others, which would be to become what Plato calls a "polypragmatist" or a "periurgist"—a kind of busybody whom St. Paul also condemns. (I. Thess. iv., 11; I. Tim. v., 13.) What the Apostle reprobated was not strenuous action, of which he himself gave a prime example. (Acts xviii.) Aristotle is thought not himself to have written the very imperfectly constructed book

¹ Many of our modern books on ethics pay no attention to justice as a special virtue, and hence make little of it; it gets but occasional mention. Thus Mr. Muirhead is content with saying: "Justice be'ore generosity. Generosity, it is implied, presupposes justice. On the other hand, justice presupposes generosity, which is only justice adequately conceived" (pp. 199, 200, second edition). There is another bare mention of the word, pp. 196-201. Professor James Seth is equally casual on justice and generosity ("Ethical Principles").

in the Ethics which treats of Justice. (Book V.) There the Pythagorean idea of equality is given a fundamental place; but it cannot be upheld as a rigid equation between all its terms or in the figure of the square which was used by Pythagoras for the purpose. In the equation $\frac{2}{4} = \frac{2000}{4000}$, if the numbers on the right hand could speak for themselves, they would protest strongly against being reduced in magnitude to 2 and 4 respectively by a process which, in the interest of mere proportion, the mathematician would carry out without a qualm in order to get the identity $\frac{2}{4} = \frac{2}{4}$. Even on the ground of quantity objection might be raised, while quality would increase the objection indefinitely. When then Aristotle declares that the just is the equal and the unjust the unequal he does not mean an absolutely dead level of treatment all round among men.²

In Book V., c. ii., he makes a rough division of justice more or less into public and private; he calls the two parts respectively distributive and dioretic, which latter word is by some translated corrective and by others directive. By the first the distributors of good things to the citizens will make a fair distribution, while by the latter the citizens between themselves will be fair in their several dealings. This imperfect sketch was taken up and improved by the scholastics among whom were discriminated, not with absolute uniformity of explanation, (1) *distributive* justice, whereby rulers gave to their subjects equitable shares in the emoluments and the burdens so far as it belonged to the State to apportion those things desirable and undesirable. (2) Then came *legal* justice, making each citizen contributive to the common welfare according to his degree. (3) Lastly, came commutative justice between citizens as equals in their transactions one with another. If the king entered a retail shop to purchase a trifling article, he would in that relationship be the equal of the vendor, and would have to observe commutative justice by paying the sale value of the article, as any of his subjects would do. Here equality of justice is seen in its fullest degree, in the rendering of *quid pro quo*.

For practical purposes Aristotle takes men as Hobbes did, namely, as equal, so that no individual has an out-and-out preëminence over all the rest, after the manner of Nietzsche's *Ueberschensch*, which term, perhaps, we shall with least ambiguity translate by the hybrid "superman." In a playful way, nevertheless, Aristotle does lay down the position of the superhuman individual to be theoretically that of ruler by innate right over all his inferiors. "Wherever there is a whole family, or an individual, that is superexcellent above the rest, it is just that such family or individual should reign supreme.

² His derivation of dike, justice, from dicha, as if it were a dichotomy into two equal parts, is a mistake in etymology.

Assuredly it is not proper to put to death or to outlaw or even to ostracize them, or to make them take their turn in being subject.³ They stand not as parts to the whole, but as whole to parts." ("Politic" iii., 17.) In an earlier chapter of the same book (ch. xiii.) Aristotle had not been so promising in regard to the supermen; for after allowing all their claims to rule and to be laws to themselves, he added that as a hard fact "democratic States ostracize their exceptionally superior individuals. Similarly the Argonauts would not take Hercules with them; they left him in the lurch. Again, the heads of overtopping ears of corn are cut off. A choirmaster will not give a place in his chorus to a singer who has a voice overpoweringly stronger and better than the voices of the rest." Still, as to justice, there is none of it in this political practice of ostracizing the very prominent citizens who appear as supermen. Instead of regarding the interests of the State, these politicians have used such ostracism for party purposes. If the superman should rise to be fairly king, then as "a law to himself" he would have a light burden from legal justice, but in *distributive* and *commutative* justice he ought to be very exact and beneficent, with much self-sacrifice. In actual order of facts,⁴ not exactly supermen, but men of ability do come to the head of affairs in a crisis by a sort of natural selection.

One good point in Aristotle is that with the Greek love of reasoned procedure he insists upon justice as an intelligently calculated sort of equality, not a mechanical balance in which no decent equality between parts could be guaranteed. Some modern historians lay too much stress upon the outcome of mere social or economical pressures as determinant of individual positions in the State. Take the case of the trade guilds which once were suitable for business and now are not—at least not in the narrowness of the old form. This transition we can admit without giving the account of the matter which Professor Ashley proposes in his view of rights as unstable adjustments of forces. "Given small industrial undertakings, given the current philosophical, ethical and religious ideas, the guild system was inevitable." If this may stand what follows is more objectionable: "To ask whether or not it was justifiable

³ For average men justice requires, according to Aristotle, that they should take it turn and turn about to govern and be governed.

⁴ As a fact, such supermen as we get generally have their counterbalancing defects. Sir T. Coulston, writing on unsoundness of mind, says: "The genius is the god amongst men. His work and his thought have been the redemption or the curse of the race. He occurs rarely, and his advent is unexpected. Among his relations there are apt to be a disproportionate number of cranks, imbeciles and mentally unsound persons. It commonly takes several generations for the world to understand him. He used often to be put to death. He is sometimes entirely sane, but often enough he has a dash of brain irritability."

is to apply a standard that is not applicable." ("Economic History," Part II., Vol. I., chap. ii.) As the author himself narrates, the mediæval guilds were penetrated through and through with moral and religious ideas, and were organized with care for justice; they were not mechanical products of social pressures.

To supplement his theory of justice, Aristotle, aware of the principle *summum jus summa injuria*, adds the modifying influence of friendship and of *epieikeia*, which latter Matthew Arnold translated "sweet reasonableness." Moreover, into his rhetoric (I., 14) he introduced a passage quite in the spirit of his "Ethics and Politics," but directly referring to the mitigations of rigor in private dealings, and if also in law, then rather in positive than in natural law. He gives as means of securing the *epieikeia*⁵ which suits human infirmities, to look rather at the mind of the legislator than at the letter of the law; to regard not so much the need of the offender as his intention; not so much his isolated act as his general conduct; not so much his permanent self; to dwell rather on the benefits than on the injuries one has received; rather on the good that has been done to one than on the good oneself has done; and to call in the arbiter rather than the appeal judge.

Again, in his "Ethics" (V. X.) Aristotle tells how equity tempers Justice and is its higher form, qualifying its generalities by the necessary adaptations to the concrete; acting as the Pretor did in Rome, and as the Lord Chancellor used to do in England in his character of "Keeper of the King's Conscience." The hard stickler for the legal maximum—the *acribodikaïos* ("Eth. Nic.," V. XIV)—is condemned as brutal, as a hard-and-fast man who will not measure the angular surfaces of his fellow-creatures by a flexible rule, which is the only rule wherewith to measure the cyclopean edifice of vast human society. The spirit of the Beatitudes in the Gospel is so far anticipated that the principle is formulated of bearing injuries, "allowing oneself to be wronged." ("Rhet." i., 13.)⁶ No one will lead a decent life who seeks wholly to fight against that condition of human existence. Of course, there must be some judgment in

⁵ St. Paul is large in his demand for this virtue, not only in inward disposition, but also in outward exhibition. "Let your *epieikeia* be known to all men" (Philip. iv., 5). The English versions of Scripture give "moderation," "modesty," "forbearance;" a French version gives "douceur," and a German gives "Lindigkeit." As to the "extenuating circumstances" recommended by Aristotle, Green holds that these directly should not enter into the administration of law, whose aim is to create adequate fear as a deterrent. "The notion that the State should, if it could, adjust the amount of punishment to the moral wickedness of the crime rests on a false view of the relation of the State to morality" ("Principles of Political Obligation," n. 196). Aristotle is not dealing with law courts as such.

⁶ The *epieikeia* is a man willing at times to take "less than his just share," whereas the unjust man takes "more than his share." (Of. "Mag. Moral.," II., 1.)

the relaxation of legal rights; ours is a poor world if Huxley's description of it is true, that it tries by a loud sentimentality to make up for its folly and its injustice. Even though we cannot exactly frame another law of equity as definite as the law of justice, strained," still we may be and ought to be judiciously merciful, not strained," still we may be and ought to be judiciously merciful, not closed to mercy, saying,

Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill.⁷

Now to hit the golden mean; how nicely to qualify *la justice* by *la justesse*, which has been translated "the real right thing in good taste," is a matter wherein we can only do our best and expect to fail sometimes on both sides of the balance. It is left to the free will what use is made, good or bad, of kind allowances by the receivers of mercy. In the play of give-and-take, where no exact *quid pro quo* is our aim, we can be more generous than can those whose purpose is business and who are large employers of labor. Their position is far from easy; if they are not exacting, they are ill served, and if they are over-exacting, their servants are ill mastered. St. Paul, while enjoining obedience and religious motives on those who serve (Colos. iii., 22) is not content simply with telling masters to be just; he adds that they must also display equity, a disposition to be regulated by the thought that they also have a Master in heaven (v., 1). This is the very opposite of the pagan relationship in which bare justice to slaves was not acknowledged, for they were not regarded as having the dignity of human rights—at least not by many who wrote and acted in the matter, and were merciless to bondsmen as infra-human beings, as living instruments that had just the quality of being animate with a higher sort of animality than that of the brute beast. Christianity vindicated their manhood and demanded for them a charity beyond justice, always with due regard to possible abuse in the way of idleness or ill service. A Roman legalist of the Empire saw the aspect of slavery in which it was *contra naturam* even when the masters were good in the fulfillment of that justice which yet lacks the fuller humanity. In the relation of parents to children this lack may also be felt. In Charlotte Brontë's "Shirley" we have the defect painted in an uncle, the rector of his parish, who took charge of his niece and treated her as he would have treated a daughter of his own, had he possessed one. The niece says of her

⁷ "Romeo and Juliet," act III., scene 1. Kant, who depreciates sentiment, calls on legislators not to adulterate justice with a benevolent affection, inasmuch as "there can be no obligation to be kindly out of pity," while a contagious sympathy is dangerous in the treatment of the undeserving. ("Metaphysics of Morality: Elementology of Ethics," Part II., ch. I.)

hard guardian: "He is rather scrupulously equitable than truly just, if you can understand such superfine distinctions." "Oh, yes," answered Shirley; "good nature implies indulgence, geniality, warmth of heart; genuine justice is the offspring of sympathy and consideration, of which I can conceive that your uncle is quite innocent."

A few modern representatives of doctrine on justice outside the Catholic and even the orthodoxly Protestant school will show some aspects which may probably be criticized.

(1) John Stuart Mill felt that justice is a virtue calling for a special treatment beyond his utilitarian account of the virtues in general, and accordingly in his book on "Utilitarianism" he devoted to it a chapter. Therein he is not content with Hobbes, who founds it on contract (*Leviathan*, ch. xv.), nor with Hume, who thinks it a utilitarian need for our society, but quite out of place where there is "perfect moderation" ("Essay on Justice"); he feels that more must be said to account for the unique place it holds in the human heart. He begins with a Socratic-like enumeration of cases to which men apply the name justice. He finds it to cover the legal and the moral requirement, the matter of good or ill desert, the keeping of faith, the answering to expectations, which that man does not satisfy who takes benefits, but makes no return. Forming now an induction from his examples, Mill gathers the characteristics common to all and specific of their moral value. These are that the characteristics of justice lie in (a) what specially we should like to see men compelled to do; (b) what begets "perfect obligation"⁸ in definiteness as to persons and as to things to be done; (c) what moves a peculiar sentiment which is that of resentment moralized by the fact that its purpose is not selfish, but reaches out to the common good which is concerned in every act of just dealing, whether voluntary or enforced. Summarizing results, Mill concludes: "The idea of justice supposes two things, a rule of conduct and a sentiment which sanctions the rule. The first must be supposed common to all mankind and intended for their good; the second is a desire that punishment should be suffered by those that infringe the rule. There is involved in addition the conception of some definite person whose rights are impaired.⁹ The animal desire to retaliate becomes an enlarged sympathy for all human suffering from injustice." Here Mill hopes to get beyond mere

⁸ Kant calls the strict or perfect obligation what manifestly proves self-contradictory when a reversal of it is treated as a universal principle, and that so convincingly that the unfitness is clear and no exception is defensible. (*Grundwerk of Metaphysik*, ch. II.)

⁹ Roman law insisted that "obligatio" should be definite in its incidence on persons and things: it was a chain between two fixed points of dependence—*vinculum obligationes*.

expediency; so he introduces, besides the morality of seeking the universal happiness, a peculiar sentiment, a feeling of resentment against what is a definite wrong to somebody, or would be a definite wrong unless prevented.

With all this painstaking he does not improve on the old definition of Ulpian: *Constans et perpetua voluntas jus suum cuique tribuendi*. As we are dealing with ultimate ideas, there must be also an appearance of tautology, when into the definition is introduced *jus* and *suum*; of course, what is a man's own or his right he ought in justice to have.

Mill explains himself further at the close of his treatise on the "Subjection of Women." His prose attitude was far from the poetic one of Patmore, who believed that the male conscience should rule the female and that the weak should lean upon the strong. For the security of modern society Mill wants something more trustworthy than the chivalric idea that the strong must protect the weak. When women are called upon still to rely on such support, he declares it insufficient. "The main foundation of moral life in modern lives must be justice and prudence," which still leave a secondary position to chivalry or generosity. What Mill felt was that while the honor principle might carry some chosen souls to heights far beyond "justice and prudence," still these two were the chief principles on which the multitude should rely and without which even the élite should not be.¹⁰ It was not as a practical moralist, but as an ideal physicist that Aristotle taught optimism when he extended his principle that "nature does nothing in vain," "or unreasonably" into "nature in all things always aspires to the best."¹¹ The tendency exists in the soul, but its issue into action is too precarious to allow us to rest on it without the application of less exalted standards for the attainment of subordinate ends. We cannot truly and profitably tell mankind at large what Jowett said, probably without an exact weighing of his words, that Justice requires us to do the best we can for others.¹²

Coventry Patmore was brought to a sense of danger in optimism. "The counsels, the keeping of which is ordinarily the reward of long fidelity, seemed to me as binding as the precepts, and I was best in doing nothing by halves. I made the most extravagant and pitiable mistake, praying for example eight or ten hours a day in order to fulfill the precept 'Pray always,' and relapsing into periods of exhaustion, during which I hardly prayed at all." This

¹⁰ The character is known of one who wants to be just, but is conscious of lacking prudence and judgment, and so follows impulses without rational guidance.

¹¹ On "Generation and Corruption," II, 10.

¹² Kant also said: "Wohltätig zu sein wo man kann ist Pflicht."

is a bad way of fulfilling all justice. One who in many points agrees with Mill's "Utilitarianism" is H. Sidgwick, who copies his guide in several of his views about Justice. Trying to take this, not in its generic character as inclusive of all virtue, but as a specific virtue having its own peculiar excellence, he yet gives it a much wider scope than suits the usual tradition and is convenient for clear treatment. In it he embraces human law and the claims of rationally grounded expectations which arise from the usages of society, from tacit understandings and from ties of gratitude. He finds that the changes in social ideas from age to age introduce a disturbing element; he emphasizes the conflict between conservatism and innovation in regard to personal liberties and to the requitals proper for merits and demerits. Sometimes also defects of fitness negative the claims of merit in the bestowal of a post. But apart from such conflicting elements, the mere discrimination in itself of actions according to their value puzzles his calculating powers, while retribution according to the worth of motives is further perplexing. Thus he surveys detail after detail till he comes to a sort of rule founded on the utility of encouraging or discouraging actions with a view to the public good. "I do not see how the question can be met by an analysis of our common notion of Justice. To deal with such points at all satisfactorily we have, I conceive, to adopt quite a different line of reasoning; we have to ask not what services of a certain kind are intrinsically worth, but what reward can procure them, and whether the rest of society gains by the services more than the equivalent reward."¹³ We have, in short, to give up as impractical the construction of an ideally just social order in which services are rewarded in exact proportion to their intrinsic value.¹⁴ A similar rule has been given for the use of praise. Praise actions which you ought to promote and will thereby promote to the gain of society. It is clear that such a style of treatment is one of terrestrial expedience and leaves out the inner sanctities of justice as a virtue having more than the utilitarian value which lies in the promotion of social welfare.

The final conclusion of the chapter is a confession that for practical application in social life no very definite rule for human guidance has been discovered. "The results of this examination of Justice may be summed up as follows: The prominent element in Justice as ordinarily concerned is a kind of equality—that is, im-

¹³ Here justice is being narrowed down to a question of promoting the common good by incentives to service—a very narrow outlook.

¹⁴ "Methods of Ethics," Book III, chap. V., sec. 5. We see how in "Ethics" the author's chapter on justice ignores the full scope of its ethical definition.

partiality¹⁵ in the observance and the enforcement of certain general rules allotting good or evil to individuals. But when we have clearly distinguished this element, we see that the definition of the virtue for practical guidance is left obviously incomplete. Inquiring further for the right general principles of distribution, we find that the common notion of Justice includes, besides the principle of reparation for injury, the quite distinct and divergent elements, Conservative Justice and Ideal Justice.¹⁶ The former is realized, first, in observance of law and contracts and definite understandings and in the enforcement of such penalties for the violation of these as have been legally determined and announced, and, secondly, in the fulfillment of natural and normal expectations—an obligation of a somewhat indefinite kind. The other element, the Ideal Justice, is still more difficult to define, for there seem to be two quite distinct conceptions of it embodied respectively in individualistic and Socialistic ideals of a political community. The first of these takes the realization of Freedom as its ultimate standard, which does not give a practical basis for social construction without certain arbitrary definitions and limitations. Moreover, a society in which Freedom is realized as far as is feasible does not completely suit our sense of justice. *Prima facie*, this is more satisfied by the Socialist Ideal of Distribution founded on the principle of requiting desert; but when we try to make the principle precise, we find ourselves again involved in great difficulties, and similar perplexities beset the working out of criminal justice on the same principle.”

Thirdly, T. H. Green in his “Lectures on Political Obligation” gives us less right than Sidgwick, who professes to be dealing with Ethics, that we should expect of him an account of justice as a moral virtue. The direct end of politics as such is good order in civil society; political justice may therefore be described within the limits of this direct purpose. A rejector of Utilitarianism on its wider ground, Green, from his narrower outlook, defines justice as “the habit of mind which in our dealings with others leads us to respect the complex of social conditions which is necessary to help the individual to realize his capacity for contributing to the social good.”¹⁷ Ultimately he would on his monistic basis identify this particular social good with the good of the universal Being; but that identification does not concern the immediate purpose of the lectures, which have a mundane interest at heart, namely, that social welfare of which the author was an active promoter. The view that strongly struck him was that injustice to an individual

¹⁵ Adam Smith used the test of the “Impartial Spectator.”

¹⁶ Aristotle: *diorthotic justice*.

¹⁷ “Lectures,” n. 186.

hindered his full contribution to human well-being; it was not so much the individual who was injured as his serviceableness to the community. This is the State's outlook upon its subjects, to preserve their due freedom of action as civic units in a coöperative society. At the back of all this lies a presupposed good of morality. "The highest moral goodness is an attribute of character in so far as it issues in acts done for the sake of their goodness, not for the sake of any pleasure or any satisfaction of desire which they bring to the agent. But it is impossible that an act should be done for the sake of its goodness unless it has been previously contemplated as good for some other reason than that which consists in its being done for the sake of its goodness." (Pages 29-30.)

Green departs from the Utilitarianism of Mill; but he has a curious agreement with him in being at once a determinist and in maintaining that an offender cannot in Justice be punished for what he could not help doing. While the former says "the punishable act must be one which the agent could have avoided,"¹⁸ the latter speaks of "the admitted principle that it is unjust to punish any one for what he cannot help," and he further repudiates explicitly the Owenite theory that no man should be punished because no man could do otherwise than he does. It requires some mental manœuvring to defend together the two positions that all actions are determined by character and circumstances beyond a free alternative, and that wrong actions are punishable on condition that there were possible alternatives and the misdeeds were avoidable, which they were admitted not to be in madmen or even in intelligent men of irresistible impulses, such as that to drink. Sidgwick is involved in the same discordancy of theory. "I should admit that the ordinary notion of merit becomes inapplicable on the determinant hypothesis; but I do not see that perfection becomes less an end to be aimed at because we cease to regard its attainment as meritorious." (Book I., ch. v., sec. 3, note 2, in page 68). The remark on perfection is true and is verified in the Divine Activity; but the justification of punishment is still left to be made and observation is not to the point.

What these authors say about the nature of retributive punishment touches on an important consideration in the subject of justice—how far it includes a right of retaliation. Mill has nothing specially concessive on the point, neither has Sidgwick; they are both utilitarian in their penalties. But Green ventures somewhat further when beyond the Utilitarian end which social authority has before it in punishing the sin of the person punished he adds that

¹⁸ "Lectures," n. 186. Cf. 185: "A punishment is unjust unless the agent might have prevented it."

the offender ought to "recognize his punishment as just, as his due or desert, as the natural expression of the idea of public good." He ought to see that punishment is "his error returning on himself"¹⁹ in the sense that it is "the necessary outcome of his action in a society governed by the concept of rights." (N. 186.) This account does not reach as far as that avenging justice which does not belong to private individuals and which modern States wholly or largely disclaim, but which at least assert for God as the Assigner of the supreme sanction of His inviolable law. He cannot rightly allow that immorality or a defiance of Himself and His sanctity should lead to happiness as morality does, as if there were an abysmal gulf between the two extremes, "the great gulf fixed" between Dives in hell and Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham. No man should be able to boast with impunity, "I have done evil all my life and it has brought no final misery, though it was never repaired." The preventive and the corrective use of penalties are what human law chiefly aims at; and if you say exclusively, at any rate you cannot thence infer that the justice of God is limited to prevention and correction. Dr. Fowler seems to be speaking without full advertence when he limits justice to the prevention of positive and definite harm. "Actions can be called just or unjust only if they prevent or inflict positive harm. Law is transcending its functions when it attempts to promote good or reward the virtuous." This is too much after the way of Herbert Spencer. What is true is that civil law seldom offers rewards, yet sometimes it does; for instance, for a large family in a State where population is ruinously declining, it ought positively to promote much good by wise legislation.

Little need be said in development of the view here advocated concerning the nature of justice. It is explained, as is all virtue, by the principle of insight into the becomingness and the misbecoming of actions in reasonable men. Like obedience, it is a virtue which regards not self, but others as the subject to be benefited, but unlike obedience, it is not towards superiors only, but also towards equals and inferiors. Its aim is *suum cuique*—to every man his own of good or evil, of reward or of punishment, of property or other benefit or of mulct and other detriment. Man has an *own* or the rights of ownership, because he has a rational nature with moral exigences, in a way not possible to dead matter or to live plants or animals. So much about justice is clear in general. In detail the particular cases have to be judged on their own merits, to see how the balance is to be determined; often it

¹⁹ That is the idea which Green does not allow to have its full bearing, as did the Greek dramatists in their assertion that the illdoer must suffer for his illdoing an ill effect.

is the puzzle of some law courts, even when all the facts are clear, how to settle what belongs of right to whom. Only a positive award by authority can bring some disputes to a conclusion. To this extent the right has to be made, not found. Not alone material objects come under the regulation of justice, but also moral and spiritual objects. He is a thief who steals a reputation; such a defrauder has no warrant for exalting himself over the vulgar pilferer of purses. God also has His just demands, and of these a prominent one is that of receiving religious worship. As supremely adorable He has the right to the cult of *latreia*. The specific quality of religion as such is not justice, but justice enforces it as the due of honor payable to the Divinity. Here a secularist, who perhaps claims to be a high pattern of justice for his moral conduct, in which no homage to the Lord Creator is acknowledged, becomes flagrantly unjust objectively in deed, if not subjectively in conscience concerning the deed. There is sometimes confusion in the advocacy of conscience, as though it were set in antithesis to the admission of divine demands; this is sometimes called autonomy in morals as opposed to heteronomy. Probably the words reported of Lord Tennyson lie under some haziness as to their heteronomous relation: "It is impossible to imagine that the Almighty will ask you when you come before Him in the next life what your particular form of creed was, but the question will rather be, 'Have you been true to yourself?'" Justice in the strict meaning is not to self, though Plato makes that one-half of its meaning in the looser sense; but to yourself?" Justice in the strict meaning is not to self, though Aristotle is more correct in referring justice to "another person," which otherness we extend most of all to God as the personal Being who holds supreme rights over all mankind. Mill was in one way so purposely trained up to despise feeling as a factor in knowledge and to reject all theology that recognition of a God of Justice was shut out from him, and he stands in deep contrast to a poet like Patmore, who says that he started with a religion of inner mystic feeling to which Catholic dogma at last furnished clear forms. His challenge to his readers on behalf of his feeling is: "If any of them can honestly say that he ever actively adopted an abstract truth so long as his feelings, however obviously unreasonable, were in the main against it, let him cast the first stone at me." In the virtue of Justice Mill did allow a feeling to be involved, but not of the divine; it was a feeling of resentment moralized by its object being converted from self-seeking to universal welfare²⁰ conceived as needing to be purged of injustice

²⁰ Green also thinks that resentment loses its evil in ceasing to be individual. "There is a popular wish to serve out a cold-blooded mur-

by an animosity directed to its suppression. Such humanism, though it possesses its beneficial scope, is one which exercises on the conception of justice an injurious limiting influence. Again to quote Patmore: "The emotions of modern humanitarianism stand in the way of recognizing God." And going beyond natural ethics, St. Paul prays for himself, "that I may win Christ and be found in Him, not having my own justice, but that which is through faith in Christ." (Philip. iii., 8-9; Gal. v., 19-22.) The secularist does not pray—that is out of his sphere; but he strives to have his own justice acceptable before his own fellow-creatures, for their and his peculiar benefit and for no ulterior judge. This is not justice *suum cuique*, because it leaves out God, whose claim is the highest demand to be dealt with equitably.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE "KAIL GLEN" MONKS OF SCOTLAND.

"*Ordinale Vallis Caullum Conventus.*" London: Longmans, 1900.

"*History of the Religious House of Pluscardyn.*" By S. R. Macphail. Edinburgh, 1881.

"*Charters of the Priory of Beaulieu.*" By E. Chisholm Batten. Gramplan Club, 1877.

SO LITTLE is generally known in these days of the now extinct religious Order of Valliscaulium (often styled the Valliscaulian Order) that its very title will be strange to readers not greatly attracted by antiquarian lore. Yet in its day the order was not without renown; it flourished through six centuries and possessed as many as thirty monasteries in different countries. That it has been more or less lost sight of is due to the disappearance of its chief records during the tempest of the French Revolution; for the mother house and the majority of its dependencies were situated in French territory. Three of its houses were in Scotland, and of two of them considerable remains are yet to be seen; this will avail as sufficient reason for a brief treatment of the subject here.

As in many other instances, the order took its title from the locality in which the mother house was founded. This was a valley in Burgundy, not far from Louvigny; the title given to this valley in old French is said to have been "Val des Choues" (Valley of Owls), from an antique word denoting those birds, which would

derer. It is really quite different from popular revenge, because it is not egotistic. Such indignation is inseparable from interest in social well-being." ("Lectures on Political Obligation," n. 83.)

be probably numerous in that wooded district. This derivation, however, is not generally accepted. The mediæval form was "*Val des Choux*," which in Latin was rendered "*Valliscaulium*." The name is thought to have originated with the vegetables grown by the founder and his first disciples for their chief sustenance. It is from the latter derivation that the order was often designated by Scottish tongues "*Kail Glen Monks*."

The Order of *Valliscaulium* owed its origin to a lay Brother of the Carthusian monastery of Louvigny towards the end of the twelfth century. This religious, known as Viard—sometimes written Vido, or Guido—was animated with a desire for more perfect solitude and seclusion than was afforded him as a lay Brother with the Carthusians; with the permission of his superiors, therefore, he retired to a cave in the wooded valley in question, and for some time led the life of a hermit, unknown to men. When eventually discovered by the inhabitants of the surrounding country, his life of extraordinary penance and austerity, evidence of the sanctity of his soul, became noised abroad. His fame attracted the notice of Odo III., Duke of Burgundy, in whose territory the hermitage was situated. That nobleman paid Viard frequent visits, and when about to engage in a perilous war, begged the prayers of the holy man for the success of his enterprise, promising, in case of victory, to build there a monastery and church. This promise he later on fulfilled.

As in most instances of the kind, the first buildings were of small dimensions, and the land belonging to the humble monastery was restricted in extent. According to Hélyot ("*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*"), an ancient inscription in the church recorded the entrance of Viard into the new buildings on November 2, 1193.

Many fervent disciples hastened to join the new institute; their way of life was regulated by constitutions drawn up by Viard and approved of by Innocent III. in 1204. From the tenor of the Bull addressed by that Pope to the prior and community, it is clear that the rule was adapted from that of St. Benedict, though there were considerable differences, suggested by Carthusian usages. A later Bull of Honorius III., dated 1224, is proof of this. "Beyond the rule of Blessed Benedict," says the Pontiff, "which you have professed to observe, as far as human frailty permits, you mention certain special practices of your own." It seems probable that all that was Benedictine in the spirit of the order was derived from the usages of the Cistercians, who professed to follow the rule of St. Benedict in its primitive austerity. Thus the habit was white, like that of Cîteaux; perpetual abstinence from animal food was maintained; a deep devotion to the Mother of God was inculcate

—one feature of it being the dedication to her of all monasteries as primary titular; St. Bernard was to be specially honored in the liturgy—all these practices are evidence of a Cistercian spirit. There is, however, one point worthy of notice, which is not to be found in the rule of Cîteaux—a Benedictine monk who desired to join the Order of Valliscaulium might be received without further probation.

There can be little doubt that the idea of the founder of the Valliscaulians was to make such changes from Carthusian observance—in which he had been trained—as might render his order cenobitical rather than eremetical. Hence while they preserved many Carthusian practices—such as wearing a hair-shirt continually, reciting privately the offices of the Blessed Virgin and of the Dead, keeping perpetual enclosure, laboring each in his own little plot of garden ground and the like—they took meals together in a common refectory, slept in a common dormitory, assembled in choir for the whole divine office and the like, according to ordinary monastic usage.

One practice peculiar to their order was the dedication of all monasteries to St. John the Baptist as well as to the Blessed Virgin. The reason given for this custom is that “the first father and founder of the order came from the church of Louvigny, which is dedicated to Blessed Mary and St. John the Baptist.”¹

In course of time, by the liberality of the Dukes of Burgundy and other generous benefactors, the possessions of the monastery of Val des Choux were greatly increased. The primitive buildings, too, needed enlargement and restoration; a new church and monastery therefore came into being. From the remains still extant, it would appear that these were erected during the early part of the fourteenth century, when the order had already spread abroad. All dependent houses were subject to the superior of Val des Choux, who—in accordance with Carthusian usage—never assumed the title of abbot, but was known as the grand prior; superiors of daughter houses were styled prior. The order never spread beyond France except to Scotland and into Germany; as regards the latter country no records remain of the localities of such foundations; the special legislation for the priors “de Alemania” in the Ordinale is the only proof of their existence.² The number of monks and lay Brothers in each community was limited to twenty.

As it is not to our purpose to follow the history of the order in general, it will be sufficient to give a few particulars merely, before passing on to the consideration of the Scottish monasteries, which are the special object of this article.

¹ Ordinale, p. 94.

² Ordinale, p. 119.

The rigor of the primitive rule was relaxed by a Bull of Honorius III., in 1224, in accordance with the petition of superiors; it was left to the discretion of the members of the general chapter to legislate to that effect. In the course of centuries the observance became still more mitigated, owing, in great measure, to the introduction of that scourge of monasteries, the appointment of superiors *in commendam*, which consisted in the appointment of a mere nominal superior, frequently some favorite of a monarch or of the patron; this personage, often a layman, contented himself with drawing the revenues, and left the monks to their own devices. Matters had become so relaxed by the early part of the seventeenth century that the Diocesan, Gilbert de Montmorin, Bishop of Langres, was made by the Holy See superior general of the whole order, with a view to radical reformation. About the middle of the same century Dom Dorothee Jallontz, the then grand prior, conceived the idea of renewing the original observance of the Cistercians by the acceptance of some of the principles of the Trappists—instituted about a hundred years previously. Accordingly, he brought about the union of Val des Choux with the Abbey of Sept-Fons, in which the severe way of life thus begun lasted until the French Revolution swept away religious orders from the land, together with most of their records.

SCOTTISH HOUSES.

The Valliscaulian foundations in Scotland were all made about the year 1230, while the order was still in its primitive fervor. William de Malvoisin, one of the most distinguished prelates of his day, who had been successively Bishop of Glasgow, Primate, Chancellor of the kingdom and Papal Legate, is credited with the introduction of this order into the country. A man of great learning and zeal, he had been chief counsellor to William the Lion, and continued to enjoy royal favor under his successor, Alexander II., whom the Bishop had baptized. In 1215 the prelate took part in the Fourth Council of the Lateran, together with other Scottish Bishops. It is probable that on his journey through France, where he had relatives, he became acquainted with the newly founded order, and in the hope that the example of these fervent monks might tend towards the improvement in the lives and discipline of ecclesiastics, which had formed one subject of the council's debates, resolved to bring about their introduction into Scotland. The idea would be strengthened by the deliberations of the provincial council of the Scottish clergy, in 1225, upon the revival of fervor and discipline.

As the three Scottish houses were founded almost simultaneously,

we may treat them in alphabetical order, since neither enjoyed priority of rank.

Ardchattan Priory was founded by Duncan MacDougal, ancestor of the Lords of Lorn. It has been suggested that the foundation was made as a peace offering to Alexander II. and his chief adviser, Bishop Malvoisin. Alexander had made himself master of Argyle in 1221, after the rebellion of the Lord of Argyle, and had constituted it a sheriffdom; in this division he had not included Lorn, but had required MacDougal to hold it of the Crown instead of the Lord of the Isles. The erection of the See of Argyle, with the island of Lismore as its centre, had already been accomplished about the year 1200, and the establishment of the priory—a sister of two other houses in distant parts of the kingdom—was calculated to help to bring the western district into closer ecclesiastical union with the rest of Scotland, and thus strengthen the power of the Crown through the influence of the Church.

From the descriptions given by those acquainted with the district, the Priory of Ardchattan must have stood amid scenery not often surpassed in picturesque beauty—even in beautiful Argyleshire. It stood on the north shore of Loch Etive, one of the many sea lochs which break up the western coast. The principal buildings looked over the water and had an extensive view towards the south. Of the loch itself, Dorothy Wordsworth has left a striking description: "The loch is of considerable width; but the mountains are so very high that, whether we were close under them or looked from one shore to the other, they maintained their dignity . . . On our right was Ben Cruachan (3,611 feet), rising directly from the lake, and on the opposite side another mountain . . . craggy and exceedingly steep, with wild wood growing between the rocks and stones . . . Some of the rocky basins and little creeks among the rocks were as still as a mirror, and they were so beautiful with the reflection of the orange-colored seaweed, growing on the stones or rocks, that a child, with a child's delight in gay colors, might have danced with joy at the sight of them. . . . We saw enough to give us the most exquisite delight—the powerful lake, which filled the large vale, roaring torrents, clouds floating on the mountain sides, sheep that pastured there, sea birds and land birds."³

In that wild and picturesque spot the founder raised the priory church, whose scanty remains show it to have been of early English style, and probably cruciform in plan, as there are indications of the piers which supported a central tower. The choir must have measured about 66 feet in length. Like so many other ecclesiastical

³ "Tour in Scotland," edited by Principal Shairp (1874), p. 143, etc.

ruins in Scotland, these also have suffered so greatly from the wanton destruction of the buildings for the sake of the stone that scarcely anything remains except the ancient tombstones in the churchyard adjoining.

A writer of the seventeenth century, Father Augustin Hay, a canon regular of Scottish lineage, says of the founder of the priory: "He joined on to the church dwelling places moderate indeed and such as in a short time could be set up; there the fathers sighing for the habitations of their heavenly country, despised the comforts of their present life." All the monastic buildings have disappeared except one. This was originally constructed for the dwelling of the superior, and was known as the prior's lodge. It has been greatly enlarged to serve as a mansion house, though it bears traces of its monastic origin. Possibly many of the stones of the old church have been utilized in its construction since the Reformation. A wide extent of rich pasture land in the vicinity is still known as the Monks' Garden.

Ardchattan Priory has but scanty records. "Privileges," says Father Hay, "are said to have been granted to the holy house by the Pontiffs of Rome and the kings of Scotland. The place given to the devout monks was marked out, instead of landmarks, by fixed crosses."⁴ From this it would appear that the priory enjoyed, like many other religious houses, the privilege of "sanctuary." A parliament was held there by Robert the Bruce in 1308, which is said to have been the last assembly of the kind in which the Gaelic tongue was spoken.

It would seem that the family of the founder, which had given more than one prior to the monastery, quietly retained possession when the Reformation overthrew all houses of religion in the land. If we are to credit the statement of a Protestant historian, the priory was ruled in succession by Somerled MacDougal and his two sons, Duncan and Dougal, about the end of the fifteenth century. This has led to much shaking of the head and lifting of hands on the part of Presbyterians in deprecation of the sad state of monastic morality. Mr. Chisholm Batten, however, has exploded the myth. By personal examination of the tombstones which had given rise to the extraordinary charge, he has been able to refute the slander, which had arisen from a faulty reading of inscriptions. He shows that the two brothers were indeed successive priors, but that the father's only connection with the monastery was that he had been buried, together with his wife, in the grave which later on received the remains of their sons.

The name Ardchattan, it may be noticed, is derived from the

⁴ "Scotia Sacra." MS. in Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, p. 203.

Gaelic term signifying the "Hill of Cathan"—one of the ancient saints of the district, who flourished in the eighth century, and has given a name to several localities in the west of Scotland.

Beaully Priory, a second house of the same order, was founded by John Byset, of Lovat, in the parish of Kilmorach, Inverness-shire, about ten miles west of Inverness. There is some dispute as to the origin of the name Beaully. Some derive it from the Gaelic words Beal, "mouth," and Abh, "river," a title describing its situation at the mouth of a river formed by the junction of two others, the Glass and the Farrar. But it certainly received the Latin designation of "Bellus Locus" as early as 1231, when it occurs in a Bull of Pope Gregory IX., addressed to the monks of the priory. It was not an uncommon title for a monastery situated amid beautiful surroundings either in France or in England. In the latter country we have Beaulieu, in Hampshire, pronounced locally like the village which sprang up round the Scottish priory and the river itself on which it stands—Bewley.

The situation of this monastery well deserves the designation "beautiful." The scenery is a combination of mountain, moor and forest pictures, with the curving river hastening to the sea, which penetrates into the low-lying lands for some seven miles and forms the Beaully Firth.

The founder was liberal in his gifts of land to the new monastery; other benefactors imitated his example in later years, until the priory became comparatively wealthy. It is interesting to note that William Byset, brother of the founder, granted to the monks the church of Abertarff, with all its rights and possessions, in 1231—a grant later confirmed by the Bishop of Moray, the Diocesan. Abertarff is the parish in which Fort Augustus is situated; we find history repeating itself in the gift to Benedictine monks by Simon, Lord Lovat, successor to the Bysets, more than six hundred years later, of the disused fort, situated close to the River Tarff, which gave its name to the locality.

The community at Beaully would seem to have been but small. There is record of a prior and six monks in 1245, and it is not probable—judging from the size of the church—that there were ever many more in residence. At the Reformation period they numbered eight only. So even was the tenor of their lives that few details of their history survive. In the daily routine—the regular keeping up of the divine office, the celebration of Masses, public and private, spiritual conferences, sacred and secular studies, transcription of manuscripts, labor in their separate garden plots and the multitudinous minor occupations of a religious house—

they led a life apart from the world outside, serving God and invoking His blessings upon their fellow-men.

Of one good work we have record; an old manuscript of the seventeenth or early eighteenth century speaks of one of the later priors as "a man most obliging in educating gentlemen's children" in the priory, which is styled the only school thereabouts. This shows that the great work of education, so dear to monks in all ages, was zealously practiced at Beaulieu.

One of the useful arts in which these monks were conspicuous was that of horticulture. The French gardener, William Lubias, brought to Kinloss by Abbot Reid in 1540, would doubtless employ his skill at Beaulieu also, for at that time the same superior ruled both houses. In any case, there was a well-tended garden there. It is recorded that the Lord Lovat of 1450, as an old manuscript says, "planted the first orchard in Lovat, having brought with him several spurs of pears and apples from the South, and helped to plant and enlarge the monks' orchard in Beaulieu."⁵ The garden at Ardchattan has been already alluded to, and we shall have something to say about that at the third Scottish house of the order later on. It is interesting to find survivors of the ancient trees near the ruins of Beaulieu Priory as late as 1873, when Mr. Chisholm Batten saw a huge apple tree and the branch of a still larger jargonelle pear tree still flourishing.

A valuable adjunct to their landed property were the fishings in the river which the monks possessed. In connection with this subject we find the grand prior of the order remonstrating with the Beaulieu prior in 1506 because he had failed to send to Bruges, for the benefit of the mother house of Val des Choux, "fish called salmon," which had been promised by a former prior, either as a free gift or as a due.

Now and again the prior of Beaulieu would take leave of his brethren for a time, in order to travel to the mother house to take part in the deliberations of the chapter general. Such meetings were held every year, and all priors were bound to be present unless prevented by unavoidable circumstances; a special privilege was, however, granted to those of Scotland and Germany. The Scottish priors were required to attend once in four years, and this was afterwards mitigated to once in six years only; they made use of the monastery of Royal Pré, in Normandy, as a hospice on these journeys.

None of these priors, though several came of the family of Fraser—later on Lords of Lovat—took any part of distinction in affairs outside their monastery during the earlier centuries of its

⁵ Chisholm Batten, p. 323.

existence. The most notable of them all was Robert Reid, who became in 1528 Abbot of Kinloss, the Cistercian monastery in Moray, and was nominated in 1530 prior of Beaulieu *in commendam*. A man of great learning and ability, he was employed by his sovereign in many important embassies and finished his days as Bishop of Orkney. But his greatest claim to distinction is the zeal he showed in the promotion of good discipline and sound learning in the houses he ruled.

Abbot Reid had procured the services of Ferrerius, an Italian scholar, as instructor of the young monks of Kinloss in classical studies; although he had sent one of the Kinloss monks as master to the five youths he had received into the Valliscaulian Order at Beaulieu, he later on transferred the same five to Kinloss, where they remained for three years under Ferrerius.

Not content with building up a spiritual edifice of solid learning, Abbot Reid would add to the beauty and extent of the material house. The tower of the church had been destroyed by lightning in 1542; he rebuilt it and constructed a new nave. Two years later he had erected a prior's house of noble dimensions in place of the old, decaying buildings which had previously served for that purpose. So noble was this house that the Book of Kinloss calls it "a palace."

The abbot dispensed hospitality to his neighbors, the Lovats, Mackenzies and others, with a liberal hand. His wise rule tended to increase respect for the priory in the minds of men, while it upheld the discipline and observance for the good of the community monastic. Many of the improvements carried out at Beaulieu were effected after he had been consecrated Bishop; for he never lost his interest in the welfare of his two monasteries as long as he retained the superiority over them. In 1553 he surrendered them to his brother's son, Walter Reid, then but a boy. He died in 1558, a year or two before the downfall of religion, and was spared the grief of witnessing his nephew's apostasy. It is not at all certain that Walter ever made his monastic profession; he may have been a mere titular superior. It is certain that he embraced the principles of the Reformation and married, retaining his hold upon the monastic possessions.

No trace remains of Abbot Reid's noble buildings or of any of the monastic offices of Beaulieu Priory. The church, enlarged and beautified by him, is now roofless and crowded with tombstones and monuments to the dead. The church was long and narrow, without aisles; it measured, after Abbot Reid's improvements, about 136 feet long and 21 feet wide. Two small chapels, added to the primitive building, gave it an irregular cruciform shape; these

chapels were dedicated to the Holy Cross and St. Catharine respectively. The former became the burial place of the Mackenzies of Kintail; the first member of that family was laid there in 1491, having married a daughter of the house of Lovat. The chapel of St. Catharine, on the south side, was the burial place of the Frasers, who succeeded the Bysets as Lords of Lovat. Another chapel, dedicated to the Holy Ghost, stood on the north side of the nave; it is thought to have been built by Hugh Fraser, of Lovat, in the early part of the fifteenth century.

The Commendator made over the priory to the Lovat family after the Reformation; Lord Simon in 1592 was confirmed in the possession. The few surviving monks had been pensioned for life by the family in 1576.

When Cromwell built his fort at Inverness, 1652-7, he carted off much of his building materials from the Priory of Beaulieu. Further dilapidations were caused by similar quarrying on the part of residents in the neighborhood, and hence the present ruined state of the remains. In 1815 a subscription was set on foot to prevent the entire demolition of the church, which had fallen into a disgraceful state of decay. Later on an attempt was made by the Lovat family to bring about a more complete restoration, with the view of fitting the church for Catholic worship again. But opposition was roused, and the idea was abandoned beyond the putting into a decent state of the slender remains.

The third house of Valliscaulians in Scotland was situated at Pluscardyn (or Pluscarden), in Morayshire, about six miles from Elgin. Its founder was Alexander II. Contrary to ordinary usage, which was followed in both the other Scottish houses, this priory was dedicated to St. Andrew, as its conventual seal testifies. The reason seems to have been that the valley in which it stood had long been known as St. Andrew's Vale—probably from a more ancient church there. Some are of opinion that St. Andrew was an additional titular to Our Lady and St. John Baptist.

The royal founder was very generous in his endowments to the priory, so that it became in course of time, considering its size, very wealthy. Alexander was particularly fond of Elgin as a residence; the fact not only brought the little city into prominence, but tended to keep up the King's interest in Pluscardyn and its inmates. After his death in 1249 no succeeding monarch was so liberal to the monastery, though gifts were frequently bestowed during the ages that followed by various benefactors. From King Robert the Bruce the monks obtained the privilege of fishing in the River Spey.

Though utterly different in character from each, the scenery

around Pluscardyn could claim as great a right to be esteemed beautiful as that in which the other two houses were situated. The priory stood upon a slightly raised eminence in the centre of a fertile valley which was backed up by well-wooded hills and watered by a clear stream. From the remains of its buildings, which are considerable, it is evident that it must have been both extensive and handsome. The church was never completed beyond the choir and transepts; for there are but the bases of the pillars marking a contemplated nave. The choir measured 56 feet in length by 21 feet in breadth, and had no aisles. The transepts—about 100 feet in entire length—had eastern aisles, each of them containing two bays for altars. From the south transept a flight of stone steps led up to the dormitory of the monks, on the upper floor of the adjoining monastery. Opening from the same south transept was a chapel dedicated to our Lady.

The monastic buildings stood round a cloister garth, 100 feet square. Nearest the church was the chapter house, 28 feet square, its vaulted roof supported by a central pillar. Further on towards the south was the calefactory, or common room of the community. It contained a large, wide fireplace, for it was the only room containing a fire at which the brethren might warm themselves. Many are the regulations of the "Ordinale" concerning the use of this fire in the Valliscaulian houses. The calefactory at Pluscardyn was a noble room with a vaulted stone roof resting upon two pillars which divided it into two portions like aisles. Over these buildings ran the monks' dormitory and a small private chapel for the use of the prior. On the south side of the square was the refectory, and the kitchen was near it. The prior's lodge seems to have stood towards the southeast of the other buildings.

When Edward I. of England was bent upon obtaining superiority in Scotland, during the disputes as to the rightful sovereign, he advanced as far north as Kinloss Abbey, where he took up his quarters for ten days in the autumn of 1303. During that time both Elgin and Pluscardyn suffered much from the depredations of his soldiers. Another English monarch, Edward III., visited the same abbey in 1336, finding there a store of wine, ale, salt, fish, corn and other provisions, by means of which his men were "refreshed and not a little consoled;" the consolation, however, was not enough to restrain them from burning the town of Forres and laying waste the surrounding country! It is scarcely possible that Pluscardyn, lying but a few miles east of Forres, could have escaped their depredations.

In 1454 an event occurred of much significance to the priory. At Urquhart—or Urchard, as it was then styled—a few miles be-

yond Elgin—a Benedictine priory, dependent upon the Abbey of Dunfermline, had existed since 1125, when David I. had founded it. By the middle of the fifteenth century the Urquhart monks had dwindled to two only, and the Pluscardyn monks numbered but six. Overtures were accordingly made for the union of the two houses; the reasons given were the exceedingly small number of inmates in each and the reduced condition of revenues of both houses, which rendered it difficult to maintain them efficiently unless combined. Pope Nicholas V. accordingly decreed that the Pluscardyn monks should adopt the rule and habit of the Black Benedictines, and that the two communities should be united in the Pluscardyn house, which should become a dependency of Dunfermline.

A statement has been passed from pen to pen by many Protestant writers to the effect that the union was the consequence of the irregular lives of the Valliscaulians of Pluscardyn, who "had become very licentious and had given themselves up to gross immoralities."⁶ The charge is refuted with much warmth by Mr. Macphail, a Presbyterian minister, who, greatly to his credit, has sifted the matter diligently and declares that there is no foundation for the calumny. Pope Nicholas does not refer to such a charge in his Bull; indeed, common sense would suggest that the advent of two monks from Urquhart would surely be unavailing to reform the six "very licentious" Valliscaulians.

The union tended to the increase of the community at Pluscardyn, for in 1524 the monks numbered thirteen. There were six Benedictine priors in all. The last was Alexander Dunbar, who added to the church the chapel opening from the north transept known as the "Dunbar vestry."

At the Reformation the property was acquired by Alexander Seton, afterwards Earl of Dunfermline; he was presented with the priory as a baptismal gift—after the deplorable custom of the times—by his godmother, Queen Mary. Though destined for the priesthood, he was never ordained, but, becoming learned in law, filled many high offices of state under James VI., with whom he was a great favorite. He never relinquished the Catholic faith, although he outwardly conformed to Presbyterianism in a most reprehensible way. Before his death, however, he publicly declared his Catholicism and lamented his dissimulation. Under the protection of so powerful a man, the monks remained undisturbed at the Reformation and inhabited their cloister until removed by death. In 1586 there was still one left.

In 1595 the property was bought by the Mackenzies of Kintail;

⁶ Young, "Annals of Elgin" (1879).

later on it passed into the family of the Duke of Fife. A few years before his death the late Marquess of Bute bought Pluscardyn and placed the ruins and their surroundings in perfect order.

Of the three houses of the Scottish Valliscaulians this is by far the most interesting, on account of its extensive remains. The visitor cannot fail to be charmed with a place so beautiful in its decay. The picturesque ruins are chiefly early English and decorated in style; they stand amid a wealth of greenery—some of the splendid holly trees on the lawn evidently dating from monastic days.

The walls of the old church tower are nearly complete, although, like the body of the building, it is roofless. Round the interior of the church are still to be seen some of the consecration crosses. On the north side of the altar is one of the stone sacrament houses peculiar to this part of Scotland. It is really a tabernacle in the wall for the reservation of the Sacred Species. Over the space left for the door are angels carved in the stone, bearing a monstrance. Though less artistic than some other instances in the neighborhood—Cullen and Deskford, in Banffshire, for example—the Pluscardyn tabernacle is very interesting. Antiquarians have puzzled themselves in striving to ascertain the reason of these stone receptacles, as the usual method of reservation was in a pyx suspended over the high altar. It has been conjectured that the stone tabernacle was either for security during the night or for the convenience of the sick—since the Blessed Sacrament might be taken from it at any time without disturbing the monks in choir. At Pluscardyn, however, the latter reason would scarcely hold good, as it would have been necessary to pass through the choir to get to the tabernacle.

Under the arch which forms the entrance to the choir from the transept may still be discerned traces of an ancient fresco. Nothing can be seen now except a blue heaven with golden stars and the lines of a red robe; but a visitor of the eighteenth century, when the picture was probably more distinct, has described it as St. John the Evangelist writing his Gospel. Traces of painting may be seen in other parts of the church also. It seems probable that the skilled painter, Andrew Bairhum, employed by Abbot Reid in the decoration of the abbey church of Kinloss, may have exercised his talents in the neighboring priory.

When the writer visited Pluscardyn on three several occasions the calefactory was fitted up with pews and pulpit for use as a temporary place of worship for Presbyterians; the dormitory was then in use for tenants' dances. But with the advent of a Catholic proprietor such abominations have been swept away.

Not the least of the charms of this interesting place is the secluded monastery garden. Many of the ancient walnut and other trees which supplied the monks with fruit are still flourishing. In recesses of the high wall beehives once stood. The quiet of the place, far removed from any dwelling, except that of the custodian at the lodge near the entrance gate, seems to breathe still of monastic peace and rest. It is a fair specimen of many like havens of calm which were to be found in Catholic Scotland. May they spring up again and multiply apace!

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

REGINALD POLE, PRINCE OF THE CHURCH.¹

II.

NO MORE convincing evidence of the Papal approval of the work done by the commission to which had been entrusted the task of making arrangements for the assembling and general conduct of the proceedings of the General Council is needed than the fact that Paul III. selected three of its members for elevation to the Sacred College. These were Pole, Caraffa and Sadoletto. As M. Haile recalls after daily conferences, under Contarini's presidency, held in his own palace, the result was presented to the Pope in the spring of 1537 in the shape of a report entitled "*Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia*," drawn up by Pole, and signed by all the members of the commission: Cardinals Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoletto and Pole, the Archbishops of Salerno and Brindisi, the Bishop of Verona, the abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice, and "Frater" Thomas, Master of the Sacred Palace. The ecclesiastics named were all men of the highest personal character, well known to deplore the existence of the gross abuses in the management of the concerns of the Church which had come into existence in many countries owing to the baleful influence exercised by secular princes who had sought to reduce it to the level of a mere appanage of the State.² The report of the commission was a tremendously

¹ "Life of Reginald Pole," by Martin Haile, second edition. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1911.

² In a note Mr. Haile remarks that: "It is repeatedly said that the Popes of that period were averse to reform, fearing its effect upon the Roman Court; but the publication now in process of the Pontifical registers is a solemn refutation of the accusation. The Constitution "*De Reformatione Curiae*" of the 13th December, 1513 (Hergenröther, *Regista Leone X.*, No. 1,736), alone suffices to prove how seriously Pope Leo X. desired the reform of the Court of Rome."—G. B. Pighi: *G. M. Giberti, Vescovo di Verona*," Verona, 1900.

outspoken document and attested in the clearest fashion how far its authors were from being mere courtiers or sycophants. The document still exists to prove this fact. It pointed out, first of all, the measureless exaltation of the Papal power by servile counsellors, who had sought to prove, on unstable grounds, that the Pope is the possessor, and not merely the custodian of all benefices. The Vicar of Christ ought not to use the power of the keys committed to him by God for purposes of gain, and it is incumbent upon him to take care that his lieutenants—Bishops and priests—should be worthy of their office. Numberless evils flow from the great carelessness with which sacred offices are bestowed—the contempt of the spiritual state, the neglect of the worship of God. After all the abuses, down to the neglected and dirty appearance of some of the officiating clergy in St. Peter's, have been enumerated, with a directness of language which reminds us that the commission had employed the pen of the writer of the "De Unitate," the report ended with the confident hope that under Paul III.'s pontificate God's Church would emerge cleansed and beautiful as a dove to the perpetual honor of his name. Lastly, the report addressed a personal appeal to His Holiness in the following impressive words: "Thou hast taken the name of Paul; thou wilt, we trust, follow the example of St. Paul. He was chosen to carry the name of Christ to the heathen; thou, we hope, are chosen to make that almost forgotten name live again in the hearts and works of the heathen and of us churchmen; to heal our disorders, to bring back the sheep to the fold and to turn away the anger of God, which we have deserved, from our heads."

Naturally enough, there were to be found some, even in Rome itself and in high positions at the Papal court, who had small sympathy with the recommendations contained in the report, and Mr. Haile records that many earnest and well-meaning Cardinals, whose spokesman was the Archbishop of Capua, Nicholas of Schomberg, a Dominican of rare merit, who had been raised to the purple by Leo X., were convinced that the moment was not opportune; they represented to the Pope that the reform was a measure of such high importance that it should be undertaken by the concurrent authority of all the national churches, rather than by the Papal authority alone, and advised a delay, until it could be referred to a general council. To this Cardinal Caraffa replied, urging the immediate necessity of the work, which could not be deferred under pain of mortal sin; where the path of duty was plain, it would be wrong to hesitate through fear of possible evil consequences. The truth of the last statement was abundantly proved by the fact that the "Consilium" fell at once into the hands of the Protestants;

and was repeatedly published by them as a proof, in the words of the Lutheran, Sturmius, addressed to the commissioners—"that we did not dissent from you without great and just causes." It is probable that Cardinal Pole had left Rome when the "Consilium" was presented to Paul III., although Bellarmin's assertion, that it was not handed to him until after Pole's return from the English legation, is disproved by the fact that Cardinal Schomberg, the chief opponent to the promulgation of a Bull embodying the suggestions of the commission, died in the following September, several weeks before Pole's return to Rome. Simultaneously with the dispatch of Pole to England, to endeavor to win back Henry VIII. to his allegiance to the Church, the Pope had sent John Anthony, Count Campeggio, to Scotland as the bearer to the reigning sovereign of that realm, James V., announcing that he had sent Pole as Legate "to the people of England." The distinction implied will be noted. Henry had forfeited all personal right to be longer regarded as a Catholic monarch in union with the Holy See. Count Campeggio was the bearer to the Scotch king of a valuable sword and hat, which, according to the custom of the time, the Pope had blessed on Christmas night. Pole's instructions seem to have required him to exhaust all the resources of argument and solicitation with Henry before promulgating against him in his own dominions the Papal censures of which he was the bearer, and these instructions would no doubt have been faithfully observed by the Cardinal had it been possible to fulfill his mission. This, however, was precisely what he was not permitted to do. At the moment when Pole accepted the mission entrusted to him the whole of the north of England had risen in arms against Henry, demanding the restoration of the ancient religion of the realm. The insurrection was, however, mercilessly suppressed by the King's forces, under the command of the Duke of Norfolk. This suppression was effected by means of almost incredible barbarities. Moreover, not only the Emperor of Germany, Francis I., but the King of France desired for reasons of state to remain on terms of alliance with England, and consequently refused wherever they could to afford facilities for traveling through their dominions to the Papal Legate. The French monarch was even guilty of the unparalleled discourtesy of refusing audience to the Cardinal, and eventually the latter had to abandon his task as hopeless. The seeds were being laid already of that faithlessness to Catholic duty which was to eventuate in the bloodshed and impieties of 1792 and the Reign of Terror. It must not, however, be forgotten that the foreign as well as the domestic policy was almost demoniacally astute. He first persuaded his rebellious subjects that he would alleviate their grievances, and

actually granted them formal pardon of their legal treason, but this was only preliminary to their execution. Abroad he kept both the Emperor of Germany and the King of France in continual fear that, if either cast in his lot with the Pope, all the power of England would be ranked on the side of the other. The situation both at home and on the Continent is well described by Mr. Haile when he says that although Lord Darcy and Robert Aske, after the King's pardon, had been mainly instrumental in putting down Sir Francis Bigod's rebellion, they were treated as he was. Lord Hussey, who, in former days with Darcy, had sought through Chappuys to induce Charles V. to come to the assistance of Katherine of Arragon and the Church in England, was tried, with his old friend, at Westminster on the 15th of May and executed on Tower Hill on the 30th of June. To these must be added Sir Robert Constable, Sir Thomas Piercey, Sir Stephen Hambleton, Sir John Bulmer, George Lumley, Nicholas Tempest, William Thurst, abbot of Fountains, Adam Sudbury, abbot of Gervaux, the abbot of Rivers, William Wold, and several others of lower rank. Most of them in vain produced their certificates of free pardon and proved conclusively that since their submission at Pontefract they had taken no part in any new movement against the King's authority. One woman was comprehended in the slaughter—Lady Bulmer, "a very fayre creature and a beautiful," was burned at the stake at Smithfield. By such means did Henry VIII. bring to subjection the independent men of the North, reducing them to the cowed and humbled state of the commons of the South, of the nobility and of the servile clergy who registered the acts of his spiritual authority.* It was not solely by the weight of his overmastering tyranny that he gained his ends, but by a combination of ferocity with statesmanship as able as it was unscrupulous. In his foreign policy he was equally successful. The height to which the genius of Wolsey had raised the power of England Henry had been clever enough to maintain—

* Mr. Haile points out that with regard to the answer made by Henry VIII. to the just and reasonable demands of the men of the north, Dr. Gairdner remarks: "In such a case he was his own prime minister. The Duke of Norfolk wrote to Darcy that the King had taken very great pains with the reply, writing it out with his own hand, and making no creature privy thereto till it was finished. The answer he made was that of a skilled tactician. Some of the complaints, he said, were so general that it was difficult to meet them, but as to the faith, if it was the faith of Christ and the Church, if it was the Church of England, he had done no injury to either. All that he had done was according to law and for the benefit of his subjects. As to councillors of noble birth, how came they to think that there were more at the beginning of his reign than now? There was no foundation for such an opinion. In any case it did not become subjects to appoint a council for their King but if they could prove the disloyalty of any of his present council he would proceed against them."—Vol. XI., Preface, p. xxxviii.

a task facilitated by the almost chronic state of war between the empire and France—to each of whom it was easy to hold out hopes of coöperation, thus keeping both eager to stand well with him; and his daughter's hand was still, as it had been since her birth, the chief counter in his game of politics, which amply explains why that hand, so often tendered, was never bestowed. At this moment he was negotiating with the Emperor for Mary's marriage with Don Luis, of Portugal, Charles V.'s nephew, and with Francis I. for a match with the Duke of Orleans. Mary was illegitimate by Act of Parliament, but since Rome's decision in favor of her mother, Europe disregarded that, and it was an understood thing that her marriage would be preceded by another Act reversing the first. This fully explains what followed in the course of Cardinal Pole's legation.⁴ The Papal Bull appointing Pole as Legate enjoined him to do all within his power to induce Henry to abandon his evil proceedings, but it also directed him, in the event of his failing to secure this result by peaceable methods, to encourage the people of England to resort to insurrectionary methods in order to bring His Majesty to a right way of thinking. It is by no means improbable that the King knew all about Pole's instructions, for he had his spies even in Rome. That he would soon have discovered them, had the Cardinal been allowed to land within his dominions, may be taken for granted, as well as that His Eminence would speedily have been executed unless—like some other of Henry's victims—he “died of joy” in the Tower on discovering how great was the clemency and goodness of that murderous and adulterous miscreant. Under all the circumstances and considering the methods and manners of the time, it is perhaps scarcely to be wondered at that Henry undoubtedly employed a number of bravoës to find opportunities to assassinate the Pope's envoy or to kidnap him and bring him prisoner to England. This policy, however, proved as futile as did that which Pole was engaged in carrying into effect. It is deplorable to be compelled to note that Henry's chief agent in making arrangements for the assassination or capture of the Cardinal was Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who later on, when religion was restored under Queen Mary, returned to his allegiance to the Holy See and eventually died deploring the crimes of which he had been guilty through sheer sycophancy and self-seeking in the days of her tyrannous father. On this point Mr. Haile says that Henry could ill brook a partial success; it was not enough to have compelled the King of France and the Regent of the Netherlands to the hitherto unheard-of step of refusing audience to a Papal Legate; so long as Reginald Pole was alive and free, the King could

⁴Haile's “*Life of Reginald Pole*,” pp. 203-204.

not live content, and any means were good to attain his ends. A letter to Gardiner and Brian, dated Greenwich, 25th of April, makes his purpose plain, and also shows how he used personal apprehension as a fulcrum for moving his servitors to his will; for he begins with the ominous reminder that Gardiner has not yet purged himself from the charge of saying that Henry would be content if Pole were driven out of France. He must now, therefore, suggest to Francis I. (telling him, however, that he has no command to do so) that as Pole is at Cambray, a place which, though neutral, France has a certain interest in, and which is not far from the English marches, he should do what he can to get Pole expelled from it—

"And for as much as we would be very glad to have the said Pole by some means trussed up and conveyed to Calais, we desire and pray you to consult and devise between you thereupon."

If they think it feasible, Brian shall secretly appoint fellows for the purpose.⁵

The thing was soon planned, and Sir Thomas Palmer, porter of Calais, wrote to Cromwell, apparently on the 6th of May, that he would start next day for Flanders, on the pretense of buying a horse, and would get half a dozen persons to meet him at Gravelines. His real object may be divined from a subsequent letter to Lord Lisle, Deputy of Calais, in which he writes:

"The man you wot of doth not come out of his lodging, nor intends not, as I can learn; for I take the French King too much to be his friend, which I trust he will repent at length."⁶

This failure is alluded to in a letter from Cromwell to Gardiner and Brian, dated Hampton Court, 18th of May, telling them the King is not inclined to advance money for Pole's apprehension, seeing that the matter has got wind, and Pole is warned to look after himself; but if they can induce those to whom they have already broached the matter to do it for some reward in case of success, the King will make good their promise. God's Providence, however, marvelously protected the illustrious Legate, and eventually, after many hairbreadth escapes from the designs of his enemies, he reached Rome, where, on Friday, October 18, 1537, he was received in public consistory by the Pontiff, and gave the assembled Cardinals an account of his mission as well as of the methods by which its purpose had been defeated. His Eminence was, however, never long idle and promptly reëngaged in his previous work of assisting in making the arrangements necessary for the holding of the general council. Our present purpose, however, is not to deal with the history of the Council of Trent, the enactments of

⁵ Add. MS., 25, 114, f. 262.

⁶ Gairdner. Vol. XII., Part I., Preface, p. xxxix.

which form the major portion of what may be styled the existing statute law of the Church.

Meantime things were going from bad to worse in England, and as Mr. Haile recalls, relative to 1538, the ferocity of the King's proceedings increased with the progress of the year, beginning with the burning of Friar Forrest, the Franciscan who had been Queen Katherine's confessor, for declining to relinquish his habit without the Pope's permission; while, to show his orthodoxy, Henry had two German Anabaptists burned for heresy. Thomas Miller, Lancaster Herald, was put to death at York in August for having bowed the knee to Robert Aske and endeavored to pacify the rebels, for which imaginary crime he was tried a year and a half after it had been committed. With him suffered Henry Litherland, vicar of Newark, and Robert Moreby, a monk of Fountain's Abbey, with sixteen smaller offenders. The events of September included the solemn farce of the trial and burning of the bones of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the citation of a man who had lain two hundred and fifty years in his tomb, to appear in court and answer to a charge of treason; the court seated solemnly at Westminster, after the thirty days—allowed by canon law—had been suffered to elapse, and, as the saint did not put in an appearance, judgment would have been given against him in default, had not the King of his special grace assigned to him a counsel. When the Attorney General and the advocate of the accused—with what feelings we may be allowed to wonder—had made their speeches, Thomas, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, was pronounced guilty of rebellion, contumacy and treason, his bones to be publicly burned, the offerings which had been made at his shrine, and accumulated treasure of enormous value, adjudged the personal property of the reputed saint—and here we find the key to proceedings which might appear the result of pure dementia—forfeited to the crown.⁷ All this time Henry, with the assistance of foresworn and opportunist prelates of the stamp of the Bishop of Winchester, was publishing treatises in defense of his own pretensions and generally posing as a true defender of the original faith of the Church, while he was engaged in constant intrigues on the Continent to make the council as abortive as he had succeeded in rendering Pole's mission. Referring to this terrible period, Mr. Haile further says that by the end of the year Henry VIII. appears to have reached that stage in a tyrant's career when the sentiment of fear lends its own sinister color to his crimes,

⁷ In November Henry exercised in person the judicial function attached to his supremacy by presiding, clad in white silk, at the trial of Lambert, a London schoolmaster. When the prisoner threw himself on his Majesty's mercy: "Then," said the King, "thou must die, for I will not be the patron of heretics."

the rampart of heads never appears high enough, the stream of blood wide enough to ensure security, and he strikes again and again, and still in vain; for the phantoms and fearful shapes moving in the plain beyond loom all the more threateningly, strike how he may. In December the King aimed an appalling blow at the most illustrious heads in the kingdom, sending his nearest kinsmen to the scaffold on charges as flimsy as those upon which Buckingham had been sent to his doom twenty years before.⁸

Once more, however, we must remind our readers that our business in this article is not so much with events of this kind as with the actual facts connected with the career of Reginald Pole. We may, at the same time, fairly urge that to arrive at a proper understanding of the actions and policy of that glorious servant of the Church, it is absolutely necessary to have something like correct acquaintance with the problems by which he was confronted. England—the England which he loved so dearly and for the saving of which from the blighting effects of heresy he would willingly have sacrificed his life—was in a state approaching chaos, so far as the interests of religion were concerned. His own elder brother, Henry, Lord Montague, and his younger, Sir Geoffrey Pole, were among the latest victims of Henry's barbarity. Both were tried and sentenced to death, but only Montague was executed. Reginald—a weak-minded, weak-kneed creature—was pardoned after having, in a paroxysm of terror, tried to commit suicide by stifling himself with a cushion. Both for the saving of their lives and possessions had been facile sycophants of the bloodthirsty King, and their only offense was that they were brothers of the fearless Cardinal. Pole so far had only received the tonsure, but on the 21st or 22d of November, 1538, the Pope conferred on him the four minor orders.

Very soon after this, on the 27th of December, Pole was dispatched by the Pope on a new mission, the object of which was to endeavor to secure the full coöperation of the Emperor Charles V. and the King of France in carrying into execution the great and statesmanlike plan he had formed for bringing to an end the appalling career of sin and criminality which Henry was pursuing. As Mr. Haile tells the story, in his instructions to Pole, the Pope orders him to urge the Emperor, on account of the impiety and ferocity of the King of England, to undertake the reduction of his realm

⁸ "If any one living in happier times be disposed to wonder at all this injustice and how it could safely have been perpetrated on prominent men in a high-spirited nation like the English, he must remember that the merits of the case were not at all clearly or fully set before the public. The mode of trial always bore hard upon the accused, and if the people at large suspected, as they did, that all was not perfectly equitable, matters of State were not theirs to pry into. They could only compassionate in silence the victims of oppression."—Gairdner, Vol. XIII. Part II, Preface.

to the true religion, and no longer to suffer that King to rage with impunity against God and His saints. The Pope had prepared a new Bull, and published it in Rome, renewing the execution of the Bull of 30th of August, 1535, which had been suspended in hope of Henry's amendment; and in the confederacy he and Pole were anxious to bring about, resort to arms would in all probability have been unnecessary. All that was wanted was to treat as outside civilization a tyrant who had shown himself utterly regardless of all human ties and of all religious sanctions. Had England been effectually isolated in the way Paul III. intended, and as Pole was directed to press upon the Emperor, by the prohibition of all commerce, Henry's subjects would have been unable to endure the situation, and Henry himself would have been compelled to make peace with the Church and atone for past transgressions as the only condition for retaining the throne. If the two leading princes of Christendom could have agreed in this line of action, England would have had a very uncomfortable neighbor north of the Tweed, and Henry would have found himself, like his predecessor, King John, compelled by a Papal interdict and a foreign invasion, aided by his own subjects, to rule over the latter more like a Christian prince. It is noteworthy that, nearly three centuries later, Napoleon in his plan of campaign against England largely adopted Pope Paul's policy of organizing a Continental boycott of English commerce.

The terrible tragedy of the reign of Henry VIII., followed by the sacrilegious comedy of that of Edward VI., both came to an end at last, and on the 1st of October, 1553, Queen Mary was duly crowned as sovereign of England, France and Ireland—a ceremonial formula long continued by successive rulers of England, the word "France" being first omitted in the case of George III. We are told by Mr. Haile that next day Ferrario reported to Duke Ercole that a description of the magnificent ceremonies would need a volume, but he gives us one interesting detail: "The Queen went in one carriage, the most serene Elizabeth in another, with the Duchess of Cleves, in former times Queen"—*altre volte regina*. Elizabeth carried the crown in the Abbey, and the French Ambassador Noailles' whispered reply to her whispered remark—" 'Tis mighty heavy"—"It will feel much lighter on your own head," can hardly have referred to the order of natural succession to a monarch of thirty-seven years of age.

In his letter Ferrario continues: "Every one speaks most honorably of Cardinal Pole, and were it to please him to return to his native country, there can be no doubt that he would be welcomed, honored and respected, *'osservato'*—as he deserves."

The suggestion was entirely in accordance with Pole's own desires, because he felt that what the new Catholic ruler of England needed most of all was a counsellor of English birth, whose patriotism was as unimpeachable as he knew his was. Grave danger existed that the people might be persuaded that Mary was merely a puppet inspired by foreign princes, while the past proceedings of the only capable politician among her advisers—Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester—left grave room for doubt as to his orthodoxy in purely spiritual matters and no room at all for doubt as to his attitude concerning the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ in the government of the Church. Accordingly, he wrote to the Queen, telling her that he is moved to do so by the Emperor's letters to him, through the Bishop of Arras, recommending delay and urging the postponement of his legation to a more suitable time. The arguments are those of a prudent prince, but Pole, calling to mind the great benefits God has bestowed upon Mary, thinks that she may accept the guidance of the Divine light in matters of religion rather than that of human prudence. After a touching allusion to Mary's steadfastness and to all she had suffered for her faith, now that that stormy time is past, should not the light which formerly burned dimly in a lantern be placed *super candelabrum, ut luceat omnibus?*⁹ It would be to the Queen's dishonor if she were to turn back, lamp in hand, as if it lacked oil, and instead of trusting to the light hitherto fed by the oil furnished by her Lord and spouse, she were to seek that which is sold in the shops of human prudence. Pole advises her rather to encourage the Emperor by her example on that point, on which he has not the heart to encourage her, and he begs her to try and tranquillize Charles V. on the subject before Pole's arrival at his court as Legate, now appointed to him and to the King of France to negotiate peace between their Majesties. Having thus announced his new legation, the Cardinal touches upon the question of those who fear the loss of their property. Human prudence will devise means to remove similar obstacles, and the Pope is so much inclined to gratify the Queen and the kingdom that nothing could be demanded for her own consolation and the benefit of the realm which His Holiness is not ready to grant. Mary's reply to the Cardinal—not quite improbably dictated or inspired by Gardiner—was somewhat non-committal. It made no reference to Pole's contemplated mission to her realm, but expressed a fervent hope that Parliament might repeal its monstrous statutes subversive of the old religion and that she might be enabled to give

⁹ "No man when he hath lighted a candle placeth it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all who are in the house."—St. Mark iv., 21; St. Luke x., 33.

full effect to her own desire to safeguard the interests of the Church. The Cardinal had already sent to London his own faithful chamberlain, Henry Penning, who was in close communication with the worried and almost distracted Queen, and he sent Pole a long account of how matters were proceeding. He told that Mary had been in great fear that her coronation, according to the ancient rite, would produce serious disturbances. No turmoil, however, had arisen, but, on the contrary, the new sovereign had been received with enthusiastic acclamations as she passed through the streets of her capital. Moreover, Gardiner had acted extremely well at the opening of Parliament on the 5th of October, and delivered "a very firm speech," in which he dealt amply with the need for the maintenance of the unity of religion and the immediate repeal of the obnoxious laws. In the course of this address the Bishop of Winchester frankly avowed his own heinous faults, his deep repentance therefor and his hope that the representatives of the nation would be as eager as he was for the securing of a great act of national reparation. Penning went on to tell how:

"On the following Saturday—October 7—Her Majesty informed me that things had gone well; she had found many of the chief personages of the realm ready to encourage her to promote the affairs of religion and reunion, whilst others were of opinion that she had greater need of the curb than the spur.

"Her Majesty did not impart her negotiations with me to any of the Lords of the Council, nor to any one else, having previously ordered me to conceal myself, which I did. Her Majesty's final decision, at my dispatch, was that his Right Reverend Lordship was to come slowly—'*pian, piano*'—towards Brussels, where he would hear what more could be hoped about his proceeding further. . . . Her Majesty gave me a copy of the oath taken by her at her coronation, which she had thoroughly considered beforehand, and had added a few words to it, having for object to maintain Her Majesty's integrity and good will, as may be seen by the identical copy.

"Her Majesty also told me that she had given command for the Knights of [the Garter] to hold a chapter for the reestablishment of all the ceremonies relating to the honor and dignity of that order, which consist in the saying of certain Masses, etc. Her Majesty also showed me the holy oil which she had sent to obtain at Brussels from the Emperor."

There were, however, many difficulties still to be surmounted. The House of Lords were, as they have generally been, amenable to the will of the sovereign, but the House of Commons was more difficult to manage. Mr. Haile says that if by detaining Penning

Mary hoped to be able to send word of the passage of the comprehensive bill, framed to repeal at once all the acts affecting either her parents' marriage or the exercise of religion, she was disappointed. The Peers made no objection, but in the Commons an opposition was being organized which alarmed the Ministers, and the Queen prorogued Parliament for three days, during which interval two separate bills were prepared, the first dealing with the marriage of Henry VIII. and Katherine of Arragon, in which all mention of a Papal dispensation was dexterously avoided, and which passed without a voice being raised against it in either house, though it was equivalent to a statute of bastardy against Elizabeth. The second bill, avoiding all reference to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown or the alienation of Church property, professed to have no other object than to restore religion to that state in which Edward had found it on his accession. The opposition was confined to the lower house, the debate on the second reading lasting two days; but though the friends of the new doctrines are said to have amounted to one-third of the members, the bill passed, apparently without a division. Thus at one stroke disappeared the whole fabric of the "new religion" as established by law, while the old liturgy was restored throughout the realm. That the ancient basis of unquestioning faith had, however, been seriously disturbed was later on to become only too clearly apparent. No country can have its national creed made and remade by Act of Parliament without difficulties arising. Many of those who voted for the restoration of Catholicity under Mary had been equally ready to vote for its destruction under Edward VI. These same personages—as events proved—were equally ready to again vote for its subversion when Elizabeth ascended the throne. The curse of the time was an all-pervading opportunism. Men were thinking much more of their material possessions and how to retain them than of God or eternity. Protestantism, which then, as now, was merely a compromise between pagan materialism and Catholicity, had largely paralyzed the conscience of the nation.

At this crucial moment a new complexity arose. A number of foreign princes were known to aspire to a matrimonial alliance with the Queen, but Parliament and the people in general were at least equally anxious that her husband should be an Englishman. Under Gardiner's influence the House of Commons adopted an address to this effect. The idea seems to have found popular acceptance that the Pope might be prevailed on to grant Pole such dispensation as would enable him to become the future King Consort. While this question was being discussed, however, Mary had made up her own mind. She was determined that Philip of Spain

should be her husband. No choice less in accordance with the prevailing national sentiment could possibly have been imagined, but, as Mr. Hailes states, the very night after the voting in the Commons and after saying she would prove a match for the cunning of the Chancellor—Gardiner—she sent for Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, bade him follow her to her private oratory, and there, kneeling before the altar, she recited the hymn "*Veni Creator Spiritus*," and then called God to witness that she pledged her faith to Philip, prince of Spain, and while she lived would never take any other man for her husband. This rash and uncalled-for promise was kept a profound secret, though the subsequent language of the Queen proved to the courtiers that she had taken her final resolution. Needless to say, the belief she shared with her subjects that Reginald Pole would prove the resolute opponent of such a marriage, increased the fears carefully instilled into her by the imperial agents. There is no reason for supposing that the Cardinal was influenced by any other motives than those springing from an accurate knowledge of the prejudices of his fellow-countrymen and by realization of the intense dislike and fear of Spain which had been instilled into their minds. Mary, however, was resolute, and she wrote several letters to Pole, in which she sought to dissuade him from pursuing his embassy to England, on the ground that his presence would only add to the difficulties which already impeded the restoration of the true religion. It appears only too probable that the communications in question quite correctly described the state of the popular mind at the time, because it had been persistently poisoned by all kinds of false and malicious statements on the part of the apostles of heresy. That superstitious fear and hatred of "the Pope" which still lingers among the more ignorant sections of the English democracy and of the Protestants of the north of Ireland was a very live, very real and very general thing in the days with which we are dealing. In one of her communications to Pole the Queen—describing existing conditions—said:

"The proceedings in Parliament put this beyond a doubt, and so strangely are the minds of the people prepossessed against the Roman Pontiff that they find less difficulty in admitting all the other tenets of the Catholic religion than the single article which regards the subordination due to him. . . .

"My fears are that they will obstinately insist on my continuing to assume the headship of the Church, but I am not at a loss in what manner to reply. . . . The title in debate does not agree with kings, as the royal state, in spiritual concerns, is subordinate to the sacerdotal, and the jurisdiction of the body politic being of a different order from that of the priesthood, their power, dignity

and functions are distinct; then there is a peculiar difficulty arising from my very sex, to which nothing could be less suited than such a title and the extent of power annexed to it. . . .”

The Cardinal, however, was an Englishman, and he possessed no small share of the bulldog tenacity characteristic of his race. He was determined to fulfill his mission and he was not easily frightened, but many obstacles arose to hinder his progress, and although it would be interesting to describe these, considerations of space prevent our doing so. Mr. Haile, however, tells the story at length and in admirable fashion. Meantime the marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain had taken place with the full approval of Parliament, and the most complicated question with which Pole expected to be confronted on his arrival in England had practically been settled by the Pope before the Cardinal arrived in that country.

Mr. Haile says with reference to this matter that if the spoils of the Church in England had at first been confined to a few favorites and purchasers, during the lapse of more than twenty years they were now become, by sales and bequests, divided and sub-divided among thousands, and almost every family of opulence in the kingdom had reason to fear any measures which might induce the compulsive surrender of the whole or of part of its possessions. Pole's own opinion was that anything in the shape of a bargain on such a subject would be derogatory to the dignity and rights of the Holy See; that the return to obedience should be made unconditionally, and the rest left to the clemency of the Pope. But this view did not prevail at Rome, and Julius III. sent him, through Morone, on the 7th of November, a Bull, at the sight of which, Morone hopes, all his scruples will cease. The Emperor and the King and Queen of England, he continues, had sent Don Juan Manrique in all haste to Rome, to express their opinion on the subject, that no less could be done than give the ecclesiastical property to those who hold it:

“This appears necessary, owing to the great number of persons interested, many of whom have received these estates *ex causa onerosa*, or for services rendered to the sovereign, any inquiry into which would be tantamount to throwing the whole island into confusion. . . . The essential thing is to bring the people back to the unity of the Church and to promote the salvation of so many souls, and for the rest it appears that it is permissible to *give* that which may not be *sold*.

“Your Lordship need therefore have no scruples about the matter; in fact, the opinion of the theologians and legists has been taken in congregation, and it was agreed that if it is lawful to alienate the goods of the Church for the redemption of captives, it were

even more so to redeem a kingdom and for the welfare of so many souls."

The Bull empowered the Legate to give, alienate and transfer to the present possessors all property, movable or immovable, which had been torn from the Church during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.¹⁰ A description of the personal appearance and habit of life at this time of the Queen, from the pen of the Venetian Ambassador, quoted by Mr. Haile, is worth reproducing: The Ambassador wrote as follows:

"She was born on the 8th of February, 1515, so yesterday completed her thirty-eighth year and six months. She is of low stature, with a red and white complexion, and very thin; her eyes are light and large and her hair reddish; her face is round, the nose rather low and wide, and were not her age on the decline, she might be called handsome rather than the contrary. She is not of a strong constitution, and of late she suffers from headache and serious affection of the heart [*grave passione di cuore*]. . . . She is of very spare diet, and never eats till 1 or 2 P. M., although she rises at daybreak, when, after saying her prayers and hearing Mass in private, she transacts business incessantly until after midnight, when she retires to rest; for she chooses to give audience not only to all the members of her Council—and to hear from them every detail of public business—but also to all other persons who demand it of her."

The description can scarcely be held to be flattering, but it agrees in the main with several others. At the moment when these words were written the kingdom was in parlous case. Mr. Haile recalls that more than a year had in fact elapsed since Mary's accession, out of the small number of years—had she but known it—before her and before the faithful cousin who would have saved her, if he could, from the disaster of her ill-omened marriage. Every day which had elapsed since that event had made it more and more clear to the Queen that what she needed most of all was some authoritative adviser, and on the 28th of September, 1554, she wrote to Pole telling how anxiously she and her husband looked for his arrival in England as Papal Legate: "that we may be delivered from the scruples which trouble us and many persons specially attached to our service, on account of the censures pronounced against this kingdom in the times of heresy and schism."

There appears no room for doubt that, despite the many denunciations which Henry VIII. and his advisers had hurled at Pole, the Cardinal stood high in the estimation of his fellow-countrymen,

¹⁰ The clause, "to give alienate and transfer," had been devised by Gardiner as the most likely to tranquillize the present possessors and secure them against subsequent claims.—Pallavicini, II., p. 411.

and that had he been allowed to come to the assistance of Mary immediately upon her accession to the throne and before her marriage to Philip the whole course of the history of the country might have been very different from that now recorded. Once the union referred to took place it was, of course, easy for Mary's enemies to persuade the populace that all her actions were the result of Spanish influence.

WALTER F. DESTERRE...

ARMAGH AND ITS CATHEDRAL.

THE beatification of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett, the martyred Irish Primate, to which all Ireland is looking forward eagerly, will again rivet attention on the ancient Primatial See over which he presided. The name of Armagh carries the mind back to the very dawn of ecclesiastical history in that island. The long historic perspective which it opens up to the mental vision, covering a period of fifteen centuries, is crowded with characters and events memorable in the annals of the country. At the extremity of the perspective, as the mind's eye glances backward, one discerns, environed in a halo of sanctity, the venerable figure of the great Apostle of the Irish race, and, after him, as it were in processional order, an unbroken succession of Pontiffs, several of whom were very militant churchmen who took an active part in many momentous movements. Some have been decreed the honors of the altars as canonized saints.

By its strategical position and its importance, both civil and ecclesiastical, it has been a pivotal point, a centre of offensive or defensive operations, a rampart around which has been waged many a hotly contested battle. Alternately pillaged and burned by Danes and Anglo-Normans¹ and Irish chieftains, ruthlessly ravaged by fire and sword, the old Primatial city has witnessed many sad scenes of riot and rapine. A city seated on a hill, it has long topographically and historically occupied a conspicuous position.

Founded in 445, Armagh owes its origin and ecclesiastical pre-eminence to St. Patrick, the Primatial See of Ireland antedating that of Canterbury by a century and a half and that of Dublin

¹ It was burned no less than sixteen times between the years 670 and 1179, and plundered nine times, mostly by Danes, during the ninth and tenth centuries.

by six centuries. The story of its foundation is idyllic. Historically authentic, it is still enveloped in that atmosphere of the legendary and romantic which invests the narrative with a certain poetic attractiveness. It has often been told and retold, but perhaps never better or more picturesquely paraphrased than by Dr. Healy, the erudite Archbishop of Tuam, in his valuable work, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars."² St. Patrick, he says, had purposed to build his church and found his Primatial See in the sweet and flowery fields of Louth, where the deep seclusion of a sheltered meadow wooed his weary heart to build a house for God and a home for his own declining years. But God had willed it otherwise. "Get thee northward," said the angel visitor, "to the height of Macha (Ard-Macha); it is there that Providence wills that you should build your church and fix your chair for ever." Promptly, though regretfully, the Apostle obeyed; and, crossing the slopes of Slieve Gullion, soon came in sight of the swelling hills of Macha of which God's angel spoke—

So long as sea
Girdeth this Isle, so long thy name shall hang
In splendor o'er it like the stars of God.

The place had long been famous in the legendary history of Ireland. It was the classic ground of poetry and romance. Navan fort, just one mile to the west of the present city of Armagh, was the site of the ancient and famous palace of Emania, founded three hundred years before the Christian era by Macha of the golden hair, who traced the site of the rath with the brooch of gold from her neck, and hence it was called Eamhuin, in Latin Emania, but pronounced in Irish Avan, so that with the article prefixed it becomes Navan, or "the fort of the neck-brooch," the name which it retains to the present day. Macha of the golden hair was buried on the height called from her Ard-Macha, although the spot cannot be exactly identified. To the westward of Navan fort is a townland called Creeveroe, which takes its name from the famous Red Branch Knights (*Craebh-ruadh*), who dwelt on that western slope of Emania, where they had a school of chivalry, in which they were trained to all martial feats of valor and were always at hand to defend their sovereign and follow him to the battlefield. When St. Patrick came to Ard-Macha, that home of chivalry was silent and deserted, for Emania had been totally destroyed by the Three Collas about the year A. D. 322, after it had flourished for more than 600 years. The old order changed, yielding place to the new, and the foundress of Emania gave her name to the royal seat of a more enduring kingdom.

² Chap. VI., pp. 110-113.

When Patrick, with his train of clerics, came to Armagh, he went straight to the local dynast, whose name was Daire—a grandson, it seems, of Eoghan, son of Niallan, who gave his name to the barony of Oneilland. Daire was a rough and bold, but not a cruel prince; he had heard, too, of Patrick and of the God of Christians; so when the saint asked him for a site for a church on the Ridge of the Willows (*Druim-Saileach*), although he refused him that proud site on the hill, he granted him leave to build a church in the neighboring plain to the west, which was called *Na Fearta*, or the church of the graves. But Daire, greedy even for what he had given to God, sent down two of his fleet coursers to graze on the green and fertile meadow which Patrick had enclosed for his church. It was very necessary to teach the rude warriors of the time that God's acre may not lawfully be profaned by man or beast, so it came to pass that when the horses tasted of the grass they both fell dead, and the King's servants brought word to their master that the Christian priest had killed them. Daire's brow grew dark, and mentally he swore that he would slay Patrick and all his people, when suddenly he sickened with a sickness nigh to death. Then in great haste the Queen, "whose lustrous violet eyes were lost in tears," sent a messenger to the saint and besought him to heal her husband, for she knew his malady was a chastisement from God. Patrick yielded to the woman's gracious prayer, and blessing water from the font, he gave it to the messengers and bade them sprinkle therewith the horses and the King. This was done, and lo! the horses came to life again and the King's sore sickness left him. Then Daire sent to Patrick as a gift a huge bronze cauldron, in those days a gift not unworthy of a king. The saint, raising his eyes from his breviary, said "Deo gratias," but no more. "How did the priest receive my gift?" said the King. "'Gratzicam,' was all he said," replied the messenger. Then the King in wrath bade them go again and bear away the gift from the ungrateful priest, and again Patrick merely said "Deo gratias." "What said he now?" asked the King. "Only 'Gratzicam,'" answered the messengers. "It is strange," said Daire; "'Gratzicam' when it is given and 'Gratzicam' when it is taken away. The word must be good. I will restore him the cauldron and give him the Ridge of the Willows, that he may build a church unto his God."

So Patrick and Daire, with his Queen, and the clerics and the warriors of Daire, ascended the slope, and on the crown of that sacred hill Patrick, book in hand, marked out the site of the church and all the buildings connected therewith and consecrated it to God for ever. Now it came to pass that as the concourse

was advancing a doe with her fawn was lying under a tree. The startled doe flew swiftly away to the north, and the King's attendants were going to kill the little fawn, but Patrick said "No," and stretching forth his hand, he took the fawn and put it on his own shoulders, and the doe, taking courage, followed him home and remained with the nuns of Na Fearta ever after, giving them milk, too, besides feeding her fawns. This lesson of love and tenderness even to the brute creation produced a great effect on the warriors of Daire. They saw how Patrick pitied the poor doe and would not hurt its offspring; they saw in him the image of that Good Shepherd of whom he spoke to them so often; and thus they were made to learn that the Gospel of Patrick was a message of love—of love for God, their great Father in heaven, and for all their fellow-men on earth.

According to the Book of Armagh, written about the year A. D. 807, the doe, with her fawn, was lying on the very "spot where the altar of the northern church of Ard-Macha now stands;" and Patrick carried the fawn on his shoulders until he laid it "on another eminence at the north side of Armagh, where, according to the statement of those who know the place, miraculous attestations are to be witnessed to this day." (Fol. 6, b. 2.) The northern church to which the reference is made—built on the very spot where the doe was lying—is generally thought to have been the Sabhall, or Barn, called also the "*Ecclesia Sinistralis*," because it was to the left of the great church, for persons entering the latter from the west. The great church itself, known as the "*Damhliac*" (Duleek), or the great stone church, occupied the site of the present Protestant cathedral; and it is an extraordinary coincidence, notes Dr. Healy, that the new Catholic cathedral, the crowning glory of modern Armagh, stands on the opposite hill to the north, dwarfing by its majestic proportions the Protestant church—and stands, it is said, on that very "eminence to the north" whither the great Apostle carried the fawn on his shoulders! The hunted doe there found rest; and there, too, that other "milk white hind," during the stormy centuries of the past, so often doomed to death, yet fated not to die, was destined to find a refuge and a home.³

Whether we hold with Keating and the Book of Lecan that it derives its name from Macha, Queen of Ultonia or Ulster, wife of Nemedius Nemidh or Nevy, who was buried there, or with Ussher, Ware and Harris, that it simply means the high place or field from its elevated position, Armagh is admittedly the most beautiful inland town in Ireland.

The churches and schools of Armagh were founded between the

³ Archbishop Healy, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

years 450 and 457.⁴ The original cathedral, the Damhliac Mor, or great stone church, the *summum templum*, was a plain oblong structure, with western door and eastern window. It seems to have had no steeple, but about forty feet from the northwestern angle stood the cloitech, or bell tower, an ordinary appendage of ancient monastic establishments, one of those famous round towers which have puzzled and perplexed antiquaries until they have been proved by Professor Stokes⁵ to be of remote ecclesiastical and Oriental origin. There is some reason to think that there was more than one, for it is recorded that the bell towers as well as other buildings suffered from the effects of lightning in 995-6. There is no intimation in the whole body of our ecclesiastical authorities, Petrie says, that it was ever rebuilt, though it was undoubtedly often repaired and had transepts added to it in the twelfth century. It was before the high altar of Armagh Cathedral that Brian Boru stood as a victor—Emperor of Ireland as he proudly called himself—after he had annihilated the Danish kingdom of Limerick in 968, conquered the Waterford Danes, defeated their allies, the O'Donovans and Fitzpatricks, received the submission of the Kings of Leinster, Connaught and Meath, and in twenty-six years made himself supreme monarch of all Ireland; and it was on that memorable occasion he inscribed by the hand of his chaplain the words still to be read in the Book of Armagh⁶ in Trinity College, Dublin. It was to Armagh he marched in 1005 from Cenel-Eoghan and laid on the great altar of the church the collar of gold.⁷ In less than a decade later, after the decisive battle of Clontarf, crowning and culmination of his conquering career, which broke for ever the power of the dominant and destructive Danes, the chivalrous old King himself was laid to rest in a stone or hewn marble coffin deposited on the north side of the great church, having, when dying on the famous battlefield, bequeathed his soul to God and the intercession of St. Patrick

⁴ Besides the cathedral and abbey, St. Patrick also founded the Tempeal Na Feartha, or Church of the Miracles, sometimes called Suidhe Padruic, or Patrick's Seat, and the Churches of Sabhal and St. Brigid. On the south side of the cathedral stood the Damhliac Toga, or Stone Church of the Elections.

⁵ "Ireland and the Celtic Church," Lecture XII., p. 231, *et seq.*

⁶ O'Curry thus translates the passage referred to in the Book of Armagh: "Saint Patrick, going up to heaven, commanded that all the fruit of his labor, as well as of baptisms as of causes, and of alms, should be carried to the apostolic city, which is called Scotlicé Ardd Macha. So I have found it in the sight of Brian, Emperor of the Scots, and what I, Calvus Perennis, have written he determined for all the Kings of Maceria." In another translation the scribe is called "Mailsuthain," and we have "Cashel" instead of Maceria.

⁷ It was on this occasion he confirmed, as far as in him lay, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Armagh.

and his body to Armagh. It is recorded that the Primate, Mælmuire, and his clergy, with the sacred relics, met the remains and those of his son, Murchad, who fell on that fateful day, at the monastery of St. Columba, at Swords, and conveyed them to Armagh, where they lay in funeral state for twelve successive nights, hymns and prayers being chanted for their souls. In Armagh, too, had already rested for centuries the remains of Lupita, St. Patrick's sister, who died in 443.

St. Patrick also built at Armagh the Abbey of SS. Peter and Paul, served for many years by Canons Regular of St. Augustin, to which was annexed a school or college, which became famous throughout Europe and maintained its reputation down to the Reformation, being the oldest and one of the most celebrated of the ancient schools of Ireland,⁸ dating in all probability from the very foundation of the see. Primarily a great theological seminary, it formed part of a group of ecclesiastical structures which crowned the summit of the holy hill where, surrounded by a large rath or earthen mound and the Fith-nemhedh, or Sacred Grove, religion and learning sat side by side enthroned for many centuries, in spite of much turbulence and bloodshed.⁹ There taught St. Patrick and his disciple and immediate successor, St. Benignus, the reputed author of the "*Leabha Na g-Ceart*," or "*Book of Rights*," and of a non-extant life of St. Patrick and one of the compilers of the great collection of Brehon laws known as the "*Senchus Mor*;" Gildas the Wise, regent or rector of the school, the first historian of the Britons and a renowned preacher; Cernech, a learned priest and scribe, whose reputation also acquired for him the affix of "*the Wise*;" Mælbrighde, a successor of St. Patrick, described as "*a vessel full of all the wisdom and knowledge of his time*;" Imar O'Hagan,¹⁰ the master of the great St. Malachy (whose father, Mugron O'More, had been "*chief lector of divinity of this school and of all the west of Europe*"), and who, when made Archbishop in 1126, rebuilt the great Church of SS. Peter and Paul in more than its ancient splendors and introduced into the abbey the canons regular of St. Augustin; O'Drugan, chief professor, called the

⁸ Its degrees were long-coveted academic distinctions in Western Europe. Its students are said to have at one time numbered seven thousand, and were of various nationalities. Their memory is preserved by the very names of the old city streets—Irish street, English street, Scotch street, etc. One of the three divisions of the city was called Trian-Saxon, the Saxon's third, from the great number of Saxon students inhabiting it.

⁹ Archbishop Healy, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

¹⁰ His work, "*The Destruction of Britain*" ("*De Excidio Britanniæ Liber Querulus*"), is still extant, and shows that he was a man of large culture and great holiness, in every way qualified to rule the schools of Armagh.—Archbishop Healy.

"paragon of the wisdom of the Irish and head of the council of the west of Europe in piety and devotion;" the great Gelasius (Giolla Iosa, or servant of Jesus), who succeeded St. Malachy, raised the school to the zenith of its splendor and presided over a synod of twenty-six Bishops, held at Clone, in the County Kildare, in which it was enacted that no person should be allowed to teach divinity in any school in Ireland who had not qualified in the school of Armagh; Florence O'Gorman, a venerable sage who ruled the school for twenty years, and many others who as scribes, professors or moderators added each in his own sphere to its well-earned distinction. The work of the scribes was the transcription of manuscripts—books in the Teach-Screaptra, or House of Writings, the scriptorium of mediæval monasteries. To one of these patient penmen, Ferdomnach, who died in 844, we owe one of the oldest and most valuable literary treasures in Ireland—the famous Book of Armagh.¹¹

¹¹ Written at the dictation of Torbach, who was Primate for one year and died on July 16, 807, having before his elevation to the Archbishopric been a scribe of Armagh himself. The original, of which it is a transcription, was even at that early date a very old manuscript volume, highly prized in the Church of Armagh, and so illegible from age and use that the transcriber had great difficulty in deciphering the genuine text. It contains a "Life of St. Patrick," the oldest in existence, written partly by Muirchu Maccu Mactheni at the request of Ædh, Bishop of Sletty, and partly by Bishop Tirechan at the dictation of St. Ultan, Bishop of Ardbraccan, in Meath, in 650, with annotations in Latin and Irish, the very oldest form of the vernacular to be found anywhere. "It is not too much, then to say," says Archbishop Healy, "that the 'Life of St. Patrick' in the Book of Armagh is perhaps the oldest, and certainly the most authentic, document of its kind in existence in Ireland." A portion of the original volume was, beyond doubt, actually written by St. Patrick himself, for besides a treatise on the rights and privileges of Armagh, there is the well-known Confession of St. Patrick, followed by the words: "Hucusque volumen quod Patritius scripsit manu sua." Then there is an entire copy of the New Testament—the only complete copy of the Scriptures of the New Testament which has come down to our times from the Celtic Church of Ireland, the rest having been destroyed by the Danes—the gospels and epistles, including the spurious epistle to the Laodiceans, and a copy of the "Life of St. Martin of Tours," the father of monasticism in Gaul, by Sulpicius Severus. Archbishop Healy notes as one of the most remarkable features in the Book of Armagh that many of the Gospel headings are written in Greek characters, the last entry of all being a colophon of four Latin lines in Greek letters, showing clearly that even at this early date a knowledge of Greek was general in Irish schools. This book, from its sacred character and great antiquity, was regarded as the priceless treasure of the Church of St. Patrick. It was encased in a shrine in 937 by Donogh, son of Flann, King of Ireland, and a special custodian, called maor or steward, appointed to guard it, the office becoming hereditary in one family, who were assigned lands for their support, and thence came to be called MacMoyres—the descendants of the keeper. It was for ages counted one of the sacred relics, and its preservation was most carefully safeguarded. When Turgesius, or Ragnar Lodbrok, the Danish leader, invaded Ireland, about 831, and established paganism in Armagh, officiating himself

St. Patrick's immediate successor in the Primacy was his favorite disciple, Benen, or Benignus, son of Sescnen, whom, along with his family, he converted and baptized on his first apostolic journey northwards, when he sojourned on the banks of the stream now known as Nanny Water, in the County Meath, a little to the south of Drogheda. The Apostle seems to have cherished a special affection towards him, like that which St. Francis of Assisi, eight centuries later, cherished for his "dear little sheep of the good God." Brother Leo, Bishop Tirechan, in his annotations or notes on the history of St. Patrick, written about the middle of the seventh century, thus concisely relates the first meeting between the saint and one who was destined to be his successor in the Primacy: "He (St. Patrick) came in the evening to the River Ailbine (Delvin, County Meath), to a certain worthy man, and he baptized him, and he found with him a son who found favor with him, and he called him Benignus, for he laid hold of the feet of Patrick between his hands and breast, and he would not sleep near his father or mother, but wept that he might sleep with Patrick. When they had arisen the next morning, Patrick having blessed the father of Benen, ascended his chariot, and whilst he had one foot in the chariot and one foot upon the ground, the youthful Benen held tightly with both his hands the foot of Patrick, exclaiming: 'Let me be with Patrick, my true father!' And Patrick said: 'Baptize

as a high priest, Primate Forannon fled for refuge to Limerick, carrying with him the Book of Armagh. It is marvelous how it has existed and been preserved intact through all the storm and stress of the Danish and Anglo-Norman invasions, with their pillagings, plunderings and burnings; the civil wars and the terror and confusion that followed in the wake of the Reformation and Commonwealth. One of its hereditary custodians, Florence MacMoyre—a member of a family who from this circumstance got the name of MacMoyre, i. e., descendants of the maer, or keeper, who enjoyed a liberal land endowment in consideration of the importance of their trust—pawned it for £5 to a Protestant gentleman, Arthur Brownlow, of Lurgan, in whose family it continued down to 1853, when it was purchased for £300 by the late Dr. Reeves, from whom it passed to the Protestant Beresford, who presented it to Trinity College, Dublin. This Florence MacMoyre, sad to relate, was one of the perfured informers who swore away the life of the martyred Primate, Oliver Plunkett. The book originally consisted of 442 pages, of which ten are lost. With this exception, it is as perfect as when it was written. It is chiefly in Latin, with a good deal of old Irish interspersed. It was edited, with a view to publication, by Dr. Reeves, but he died before he completed an undertaking for which he was eminently qualified. It will, however, we are assured, be published. Meanwhile the Irish text has been edited with great erudition by the Rev. Edmund Hogan, S. J., and published. The exquisite penmanship and illumination are of the most minute delicacy, intricacy and faultless execution, evidencing the greatest artistic taste and skill. The artist-scribe, Ferdornach, described by the "Four Masters," in recording his death in 844, as "a sage and choice scribe of the Church of Armagh," was unsurpassed at this kind of work even in the finest period of Irish art.

him and lift him into the chariot, for he is the heir of my kingdom.'” By this, says the author of the “Tripartite Life,” he meant to signify that God had destined Benignus to succeed him in the Primatial See. The same author describes him as “*adolescens facie decorus, vultu modestus, moribus integer, nomine uti et in re Benignus,*” and his voice “*cunctos oblectans.*” It was this sweet voice, this organ which gave melodious expression to the Church’s solemn chants and brought out all their beauty and mystical meaning in strains where the sound was a harmonious echo of the sense, which qualified him to be “psalmist” to St. Patrick, who had trained him from his youth upwards in all divine and human knowledge and leader of the choir of priests and monks at all the sacred functions. But were it not for his solid piety, this gift, like many other gifts of God which are used only to be abused, might have been his undoing, for while charming the ears, it captivated the heart of the susceptible maiden, Ercnat, the beautiful daughter of the dynast, Daire, the donor of the cathedral site. “*C’est l’amour,*” says a French writer, “*qui traîne à la mort ou mène à la vie.*” Ercnat’s love for Benignus, a pure, natural affection, became supernaturalized when with baptismal regeneration her soul awakened to a new life and the light of faith illuminated her intelligence. The “Martyrology of Donegal” in recording his death in 493, after he had ruled the Church and School of Armagh from 455 to 465 and reached the patriarchal age of 120, says: “The holy Benen was benign, was devout; he was a virgin without ever defiling his virginity, for when he was psalm-singer at Ard-Macha, along with his master, St. Patrick, Ercnat, daughter of Daire, loved him, and she was seized with a disease so that she died (appeared to die) suddenly; and Benen brought holy water to her from St. Patrick and he shook it upon her, and she arose alive and well; and she loved him spiritually afterwards, and she subsequently went to Patrick and confessed all her sins to him, and offered her virginity to God, so that she went to heaven; and the name of God, of Patrick and of Benen was magnified through it.”

To Benignus succeeded Jarlath, who governed the see for fourteen years; Cormac; Dublach, or Duach; the two Ailills, descendants of the Princes of Hy-Bressail, or Oneilland; and Segheve, during whose Primacy the city was twice burned. In 665 Armagh was visited by a pestilence which swept away two-thirds of the inhabitants, including Bishops and abbots. Thirty years afterwards, in 695, a synod was held in the city which enacted canons extant down to the seventeenth century. During the Primacy of Congus (730-750), who was both a poet and a learned scribe, King Flath-

bert, monarch of Ireland, abdicated and embraced the monastic life at Armagh (734).

Prior to 803 the Primate and his suffragan Bishops were obliged to attend the royal army when the King set out on some hostile expedition; but as predatory conflicts were of frequent occurrence, Conmach, deeming it indecorous that ministers of peace should be compelled to witness the horrors of war, directed Abbot Fothad, of Fahan, to draw up a remonstrance, styled *opusculu pro cleri defensione et immunitate*, which was presented to King Æd̃h, who henceforward exempted the Bishops and clergy from this service.¹² It was probably drawn up at the synod of Northern Bishops held at Rathcore, County Meath, in 804.

Nuada, who succeeded Primate Torbach, was abbot of a monastery near Lough Uamha (Cavetown Lough), Brefny, County Roscommon, and reluctantly accepting the Primatial dignity, was the first Archbishop who since the time of Cormace, the third Primate in succession to St. Patrick, made a visitation of Connaught as Patriarch of the kingdom.

Armagh was one of those cities which suffered most at the hands of the piratical tribes, a mixed race of Danes, Frisians, Norwegians, Swedes and Livonians, who ravaged Ireland in the ninth and tenth centuries. The Four Masters record eight pillagings and burnings by the Norsemen from 830 to 914. The valiant but fierce Turgesius or Thorgis forced the Primate to take flight and seek shelter in Kildare, whither he was pursued and compelled, along with the clergy of that "holy shrine," to lurk for years in obscure woods and subterranean caves.

The Danes made Armagh one of their headquarters until defeated by Niall. Those of Dublin in 895, under their leader, Iron-Knee, entered Armagh, despoiled the city, destroyed part of the cathedral, demolished several sacred edifices and withdrew with 710 captives. In 923 Dublinter, a priest of Armagh, suffered martyrdom in Cell-Sleibhe (Killeavy, County Armagh) at the hands of the Danes of Carlingford Lough.

All this turbulence and turmoil necessarily had its effect upon

¹² King Æd Ornd̃he (Ordnee), who reigned from 797 to 819, on one occasion, in 803, made a hostile incursion to Leinster and forced Conmach, the Primate of Armagh, and all his clergy to attend him. Having, on the march, arrived at a place called Dun-Cuar, now Rathcore, in Meath, the Archbishop expostulated with him on the impropriety of bringing the clergy on such expeditions. The King referred the matter to his tutor and chief adviser, Fothad, who, after due deliberation, pronounced judgment exempting the clergy forever from attending armies in war. He delivered his decision in the form of a short canon of three verses, which is still extant, whence he has ever since been known as Fothad of the Canon.—Dr. Joyce's "Short History of Ireland," p. 190.

the Church and laxity and disorganization in the ecclesiastical order followed in its train. A remarkable instance of this is furnished by the fact that the Primacy was usurped by one powerful family, supposed to be descendants of the local dynast or King Daire, who held hereditary possession of it for about two hundred years, from the death of St. Mælbriuid (926-927) to the accession of St. Malachy.¹³ In this connection it is noteworthy that the two first intended Bishops of this long succession, Joseph and Mælpatrik, are styled "princes of Armagh." St. Celsus, or Cellach, the immediate predecessor of St. Malachy, was a member of this family and was only twenty-six when he succeeded to the Archbishopric, being the youngest of all the Primate. Notwithstanding his relationship to the usurpers and being desirous of bringing about a reversion to a better order of things,¹⁴ he fixed upon Malachy O'Morgair, or O'Mungair (a name which afterwards was changed to O'Doherty), Bishop of Connor, a see united subsequently to that of Down, as one best fitted to put an end to the usurpation of the Primacy, which lasted for two centuries. Wishful of having him as his successor, he sent him his pastoral staff in token of choice, but St. Malachy declined to accept the Primacy until duly elected at a national synod, which was convoked about

¹³ Many grave abuses had crept into the Church during the Danish troubles—nearly all caused by the encroachments of the lay chiefs—but they were all disciplinary irregularities. One grave abuse we find frequently mentioned—the usurpation of bishoprics and abbacies by laymen, who, of course, did not attempt to discharge any spiritual functions. Before the time of St. Celsus, St. Malachy's predecessor, eight married laymen usurped the See of Armagh ("Cambrensis Eversus," ed. 1850, p. 635). We find no indication of any defection in doctrine—any taint of heresy or schism. The ecclesiastical authorities exerted themselves to correct these abuses, and their activity and solicitude are shown by a number of synods occurring about this time. That religion never lost its hold on the Irish Kings and chiefs, even during the time of their bitterest internecine struggles, is shown by the successful interference for peace on several occasions of the Archbishop of Armagh.—Joyce's "Short History of Ireland," p. 238.

Most of these usurpers, who were laymen or married men, paid regularly ordained prelates to perform all necessary functions, keeping for themselves the lands, the nomination to the churches, and even the titles of Bishops and Abbots of Armagh. St. Bernard ("Vita Malachie," c. 10) says that this wicked and adulterous generation were so obstinate in asserting this right of hereditary succession that although clerics of their blood were wanting, Bishops were never wanting—that is, Bishops who were not even clerics—learned enough, but without orders. ("Denique jam octo extiterant ante Celsum vivi uxorati, et obsque ordinibus, litterati tamen.")

¹⁴ St. Celsus was, above all things, a peacemaker. When the country was so torn by feuds and hails that, as the "Four Masters" express it, Ireland was "a trembling sod," he made several journeys here and there endeavoring to make peace, being at one time absent from his see for thirteen months. During the last of these journeys of mercy he died in 1129 at the Monastery of Ardpatrik, in Limerick, and was buried with great honor and solemnity at Lismore.

1134 by Gilbert of Limerick, the Papal Legate. Meanwhile Murrigh, cousin of Celsus, retained possession of the see for three years and for two years longer disputed the Primacy with Malachy, until the latter expelled his opponents and recovered from them the sacred emblems of Primatial jurisdiction, the Book of Armagh, called the Canon of St. Patrick, and the staff of Jesus,¹⁵ said to have been given by our Lord to the Apostle of Ireland.

St. Malachy's election to the Primacy marked an epoch of transition, when the old order changed giving place to new. He was the man of Providence raised up to do a great work for the Church. Celsus, who was a pious prelate zealous for the beauty of God's house, was farsighted when, as he lay dying at Ardpark, County Limerick, exiled from his see by usurpers, his eyes rested upon the Bishop of Connor and he pointed to him as the one worthiest to wear the mitre and wield the crozier of St. Patrick. Born in 1095, he was educated partly at Armagh, where his father was senior lecturer of the famous university school, then presided over by Bishop Malchus, who had been trained in the great Norman monastery of Winchester and in the equally famous school of Lismore, was ordained by Celsus in 1119, became in due time abbot of the celebrated monastery of Bangor, on the shores of Belfast Lough, and in 1125 Bishop of Connor, from which he was translated to Armagh in 1134, accepting the Primacy only on condition that, after he had reformed the church of Armagh, he should be allowed to retire to his beloved obscurity, for he had drunk deep of the monastic spirit which he had imbibed from Abbot Imar O'Ædhacan (Ivor O'Hagan), an anchorite who lived holily in a cell near the Church of SS. Peter and Paul at Armagh, of which he was the founder, just as he had caught the Roman spirit at Lismore, which had long been in close touch with the Continent.

He changed the whole face of things—nay, more, he laid the axe to the root which was the fruitful source of many evils—during his three years' tenure of the Primacy, from which he retired to

¹⁵ St. Bernard thus refers to it as one of the insignia of the See of Armagh in his "Life of St. Malachy:" "*Porro Nigellius, videns sibi imminere fugam, tulit secum insignia quædam ædis illius, textum, scilicet Evangeliorum qui fuit beati Patricii, baculumque auro tectum, et gemmis pretiosissimis adornatum: quem nominant baculum Jesu, eo quod ipse Dominus (ut fert opinio) eum suis manibus tenuerit, atque formaverit.*" In the poem of St. Flacc in the Book of Armagh it is stated that St. Tassach, who lived in the fifth century and was skilled in the goldsmith's art, first adorned it with a precious covering. William FitzAldelin, who pillaged the city and churches at Armagh, brought it to Dublin in 1179 and deposited it in the Church of the Holy Trinity (Christ Church), from which it was taken, with other relics, in the time of Henry VIII. and burned in High street hard by.

Down in 1137. Evolving order out of chaos, he reorganized and disciplined the church as he had organized and disciplined the See of Connor, "laboring in all things, doing the work of an evangelist, fulfilling the ministry;" traversing on foot the mountains and glens of Antrim, accompanied only by a few disciples, his faithful co-workers and edified witnesses of his ceaseless activity, unflagging zeal, ascetic self-denial and fervent piety; feeding and cherishing the flock of God like a good shepherd of the souls committed to his charge; living a life of truly apostolic poverty, having neither a house of his own, nor servants, nor fixed revenues, nor any regular episcopal mensa. Though his work in Armagh was much more difficult than that which he had accomplished in Antrim, he was completely successful. He restored the Primacy to its position of dignity, authority and independence, and after three years of patient and prudent labor caused himself to be universally recognized as the legitimate possessor of the power and privileges which have ever rightfully belonged to the successor and representative of St. Patrick in the See of Armagh. Nor did his work end there and then. He brought about a general restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and reformation of morals throughout the whole country after he returned from Rome, invested by Pope Innocent II. with the plenary powers of Papal Legate. He was unquestionably the greatest of all the Primates since the time of St. Patrick.

The work of reformation which St. Celsus and St. Malachy began was carried on by the latter's successor in the Primacy, Gelasius (Gilla MacLiach), whose reign Archbishop Healy says is remarkable for two things—first, the success with which he asserted his jurisdiction as Primate during his visitations in all parts of Ireland, and, secondly, for his zeal in holding synods to correct abuses and reform the morals both of the clergy and of the people.¹⁶ During the centuries preceding the twelfth century the jurisdiction of the Primate was practically in abeyance; if it was recognized at all in the south of Ireland, it was certainly merely nominal.¹⁷ Gelasius convened the Synod of Holmpatrick (a small island near Skerries, called by the Four Masters Inis-Padraig, or Patrick's Island), which formally recognized the superiority of Armagh and was attended by twenty-two Bishops, five Bishops-elect and three hundred priests. It postulated for and obtained from the Papal Legate, Cardinal Paparo, who was present, the four palls which legally constituted four Archbishops in Ireland for the first time. At the Synod of Mellifort, the parent house of the great Cistercian Order,

¹⁶ "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars," p. 359.

¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*

introduced into Ireland by St. Malachy, Primate Gelasius excommunicated Donogh O'Melaghlin, Prince or King of Meath, for his impiety and contempt of Primatial authority. He consecrated St. Lorcan, or Lawrence O'Toole, to be Archbishop of Dublin—the first prelate of that see who was ever consecrated in Ireland—resolved not to tolerate any longer the claim of the Archbishops of Canterbury to metropolitan jurisdiction. In 1170, the year after the arrival of the Anglo-Normans, he held the last synod of his clergy in his own city of Armagh to concert means to expel the foreigners before they could secure a foothold in the country. "Alas!" says Archbishop Healy,¹⁸ "for the aged Gelasius, who had labored so hard and so long for the Irish Church and the Irish people. He saw the princes of his country bow the knee in homage to the triumphant invader; he saw her prelates meet in Cashel at Henry's summons to endorse his laws; he saw her petty chieftains either warring with each other or allied with the Norman. Then, and only then, the old man came from his episcopal city and kissed the hand of Henry in his new capital in Dublin. He had his old white cow driven before him to give him milk, which was his only sustenance. He paid his homage to the King, and then returned home with a sad heart to Patrick's royal city. Two years after he died, at the age of eighty-five, and after his death was recognized and honored as a saint by the entire Church in Ireland."

Conor, son of MacConcaille and abbot of the Monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, who succeeded Gelasius in the Primacy in 1174, died on his way back from Rome in the following year, leaving behind him a reputation for sanctity. Though venerated as a saint under the title of St. Concord for over seven hundred years at Chambery,¹⁹ where his relics are preserved, he remained entirely forgotten in his native country till within comparatively recent years. In

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 363.

¹⁹ The Bollandists in their life of the saint (June 4) give authentic memorials which confirm the traditional cultus observed at Chambery. Foundations for Masses to be celebrated in the chapel of St. Concord had been established there for three hundred years prior to 1689. Relics taken from his tomb in 1490 were deposited in a shrine presented by Philippe d'Allegret, treasurer of Savoy. In a hymn to St. Concord found by Father Papebroch, the well-known Bollandist, in 1689 he is thus invoked:

Ave, Pater gloriose;
Salve, Proesui pretiose,
Quondam Pater Yllandiae
Nunc decus Sabaudiae.

The use of the word "Yllandia" for Ireland is one of the earliest translations from the ancient name, Hibernia. Dr. Dixon, who said Mass before the shrine in which the body of his sainted predecessor in the Primacy rested, clothed in rich Pontifical vestments, brought back as precious relics to Ireland a portion of his rib, preserved in the Presentation Convent, Drogheda, and a thigh bone at the Sacred Heart Convent, Armagh.

traveling homeward from the Eternal City he halted at the Monastery of Lemenc, close to the town of Chambery, in Savoy, where he found a church dedicated to St. Peter and where the monks received him with great honor. He told them he came to die in their midst, and before long was seized with a mortal illness. His servants or the religious who accompanied him, afflicted at the sight of their dying master, were comforted by him with these words: "In Ireland I served for many years a Church of SS. Peter and Paul in Armagh. I have thus paid my homage to the Church of St. Peter at Rome, and it is in the Church of St. Peter at Lemenc I shall be buried." Having received the last rites, he joined his hands across his breast and gave up his soul to God. Miracles were wrought at his tomb and the sick and infirm were cured through his intercession, particularly during the plague which raged there in 1630. In 1643 a confraternity was established under his patronage and was enriched with numerous indulgences by Innocent X. and Clement X. Long before that the Benedictines were authorized by the Holy See to celebrate his office as a double major feast on June 4, the anniversary of his death. In 1792 some members of the confraternity buried his relics in a secret place, and thus preserved them from the sacrilegious frenzy of the French Revolution. In 1853 they were taken to Rome and authenticated and then sent back to Lemenc, where great solemnities in their honor took place in 1854.

Gilbert O'Caran, translated from Raphoe to Armagh in 1175, died in 1180 and was succeeded in 1181 by Thomas (Tomaltach) O'Connor, who in 1184 resigned the see to Maelisu O'Carroll. The latter died on his way to Rome that year and was followed to the grave by his successor, Amlave O'Murray, in the year ensuing. After the decease of the last named, Primate O'Connor resumed the see, which he governed for sixteen years. It was during his Primacy and at his request that Jocelyn compiled his well-known life of St. Patrick. After his death there were four rival candidates, three Anglo-Normans and one Irishman, and a conflict arose through the interference of King John, whose policy and that of his successor was by forcing English clerics into the cathedral chapter to secure the election of their own countrymen and thus bring the Irish Church under the dominion of the English Crown and plunder it legally by appropriating the revenues during a vacancy in the see. An appeal to Rome resulted in the choice of Eugene MacGillaweer being ratified by the Holy See, despite the English monarch. He was present at the Council of Lateran the English monarch. He was present at the Council of Lateran ville, Archdeacon of Armagh (1217-1227), and Donat O'Fidabra,

or Feery, translated from Clogher, after whom the see was vacant for three years.

In 1245 the name of the Archbishop of Armagh, Albertus Armachanus (Albert Suerber, a Dominican of Cologne), preceded the names of all the Bishops of Italy, Spain and France in the order of signature to the acts of the Council of Lyons. Reginald, or Raynor, and the Dominican Primate was, after the Primacy of Abraham O'Connellan, succeeded by the Dominican Bishop of Raphoe, Patrick O'Scanlon, to whom Pope Urban IV. (November, 1263), issued a Bull confirming the dignity of the Primacy of All Ireland to the see. He is styled in the Octavian Register "sixty-eighth Archbishop after St. Patrick" who had presided over the see "viriliter et reverenter novem annis." Primate Nicholas Mac-Malisu, a canon of Armagh, who was unanimously elected "per viam compromissi," and who is referred to in the Annals of Ulster as the most pious ecclesiastic in Ireland in his time, strongly opposed the appointment of English ecclesiastics to Irish sees, refusing for a long time to confirm St. Leger as Bishop of Meath.

The Archbishop of Dublin during the Primacy of Roland Joyce (who came after John Taaffe, who never saw his see, and Walter Joyce, a Dominican and confessor to Edward II., who resigned the Archbishopric of Armagh in 1311) contested the right of the Northern Primate to have his cross borne before him in Dublin, a point long in dispute and again and again raised.

Edward Bruce, brother of the Scotch hero, Robert Bruce, invaded Ulster in the fourteenth century, and during his progress through the province sacked Armagh and reduced the Primate to a condition of extreme poverty. But poor and oppressed as he was, the Archbishop was present at the battle of Faughard, near Dundalk, on Saturday, October 14, 1318, when Bruce was defeated by the English forces under the command of Sir John Bermingham. The Primate, before the battle commenced, blessed the English soldiers, moving from rank to rank and stimulating them to deeds of valor in so noble a cause. John Maupas and Edward Bruce fought hand-in-hand. The Scot fell before his opponent, who, pierced with mortal wounds, sank, a victor, on the dead body of his prostrate enemy. The Scottish army was totally routed and Armagh rescued from the invader.

Primate Richard FitzRalph, who had been Chancellor of Oxford, was consecrated in July, 1346, and died at Avignon in December, 1360, his remains being translated in 1370 to Dundalk, where he was regarded as a saint. His relics are said to have worked miracles. In a synod held at Drogheda on June 20, 1545, it was ordained that the festival of St. Ralph should be celebrated with

nine lessons on the morrow of the feast of SS. John and Paul, June 27.

As Armagh, from age to age, added to the list of those who gained for Ireland the name of the island of saints and scholars, so did it help to perpetuate that traditional association of the ideas of faith and fatherland which at many an eventful epoch caused prelates, priests and people to make common cause. Milo Sweetman, who was advanced on October 9, 1361, from the position of treasurer of the Cathedral of Kilkenny to the Primacy, was one of those who struck a patriotic note and attitude which it is opportune to recall. Six years after his promotion what is known in Irish history as the "Black Statute of Kilkenny" was passed by a servile Parliament summoned by the Duke of Clarence. It marked the culminating point of that assumption of superiority on the part of the English settlers over the native Irish. One of its enactments was that no "mere Irish" were to obtain any ecclesiastical dignity or benefice or be admitted as subjects into any monastery among the English. The King thought to carry things with as high a hand when it was a question of voting supplies to help him in his foreign wars for the aggrandizement of England. The Irish Parliament in Dublin having refused on account of the poverty of the nation, he summoned both clergy and laity to meet him and his counsel in England. The Primate replied that they were not bound by the liberties, privileges, rights, laws and customs of the Church and land of Ireland to elect any of their clergy and send them to any part of England for the purpose of holding Parliaments or councils. He sent representatives, however, but under protest and with this proviso, "that we by no means grant to our said representatives any power of assenting to any burdens or subsidies to be imposed on us or our clergy to which we cannot yield by reason of our poverty." It was on account of this chronic poverty of a despoiled and distracted country that during the Primacy of Primate Swayne (1418-1439) the revenues of the see were insufficient to support the dignity, although Louth, previously comprised in the Bishopric of Clogher, had nearly a century before that been added to Armagh.

The Primacy of Octavian Spinelli, who had been nominated by Sixtus IV. (1478), was notable for the firm opposition which the Archbishop gave to the claims of Lambert Simnel, whom many then and some since believed to be Edward Plantagenet, Earl of Warwick, only son of George, Duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV.

Primate O'Tighe (temp. Eliz.) was another of those militant churchmen of the type and mould of Roland Joyce. He accom-

panied Shane O'Neill when the latter appeared with his army on the hill outside the walls of Armagh to oppose Sussex, who fortified himself in the Cathedral and was bent on bringing the powerful Ulster chieftain into submission. Mass was celebrated by one of the friars, and the Primate walked thrice up and down the lines, exhorting the Irish soldiers to go forward, as God was on their side; but when his successor, Primate Creagh, preaching before O'Neill and six hundred of his soldiers in the Cathedral, after Shane had been proclaimed a "traitor," inculcated loyalty to the English sovereign, the enraged Earl five days afterwards burned the roof of the Cathedral and broke down the walls. So dreadful was the havoc perpetrated by the indignant and vindictive chieftain that Camden says: "In our memory the church and city of Armagh were so foully devastated by the rebel Shane O'Neill that they lost all their ancient beauty and glory, and nothing remaineth at this day but a few small wattled cottages and the ruinous walls of a monastery, priory and the Primate's palace." Shane asserted that he had burned the Cathedral to prevent the English troops from occupying it. After the fire the Primate, it is recorded, went into an open field to pronounce a solemn anathema on the perpetrator of the sacrilegious outrage. The Archbishop, notwithstanding his preaching of loyalty, ended his days in the Tower of London on October 14, 1585, poisoned, as it was commonly believed at the time. Primate McGauran, who succeeded, met a violent death likewise, having been transfixed with a horseman's lance in an encounter with the English troops at a place called Sciath na Feart (the shield of miracles). Church as well as country fared badly during Tyrone's insurrection, which reduced Ulster to a howling wilderness. Primate Lombard and MacCawell never saw their sees, although Stewart ("History of Armagh") says it is certain that the Culdees²⁰ had continued to officiate in the

²⁰ An Inquisition held on March 24 1625, at the Priory of the Culdees, Armagh, revealed the fact that the prior and monks had long totally forsaken the place. The last survivors of this religious community had passed away about 1600. Ussher says they performed Divine service there in his memory. They were perhaps the last remnant of the Culdees of Ireland, or possibly of the British Isles. A doubt submitted in 1633 to the Holy See by Primate O'Reilly throws a last lingering light on the Culdees. The Chapter of Armagh comprising only five, the dean, archdeacon, theologian, precentor and treasurer, it was considered advisable to incorporate with them twelve priests belonging to the Culdee community, with the proviso that they should resume the ancient practice of singing the Divine Office in common, as their predecessors had done, in the Cathedral of Armagh. The prior, one of those who submitted the question whether they had acted in accordance with canon law, had been prior of the College of Culdees. St. Angus, a descendant of the royal race of the Dalorodians of Ulster, born in the neighborhood of Clonenagh about the middle of the eighth century, was the first to whom the name of Culdee was given.

Cathedral choir in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth. In 1559 James Donnelly, the last prior, surrendered the abbey of the canons regular of St. Augustin, and on February 25, 1614 or 1615, a surrender was made by Primate Christopher Hampton of all the estate anciently belonging to the See of Armagh.

Primate Hugh O'Reilly took a prominent part in the political events connected with the rising of 1641 and the Confederation of Kilkenny, being one of the representatives of Ulster on the National Council. The name of "Hugo Armacanus" is appended to various documents executed about that period by the most active of the Catholic leaders. The Primate headed the spiritual peers, and both at Kilkenny and Cashel and in presence of the Papal Nuncio, Rinuccini, took precedence of all the other Catholic prelates. On August 12, 1650, he signed the famous declaration at Jamestown against the continuance of His Majesty's authority in the person of the Duke of Ormond, with an excommunication annexed. He was the supreme head of the civil as well as of the ecclesiastical government of Ireland in his time, the inspiring mind of the patriotic movement for the liberation of Irish Catholics from the thralldom of centuries, the real leader of the war which the Ulster Irish pursued to the bitter end, while the leaders in the other provinces were surrendering to the enemy, and died fighting to the last. For more than seventy years before his promotion no Catholic Primate had resided in the archdiocese,²¹ and advantage was taken of the enforced absence of the shepherds to corrupt the faith of the flock, particularly by Ussher. Primate O'Reilly labored un-

He was not only an accomplished scholar, but a model of every virtue. Hence he came to be called the Culdee—that is, the Cella De, or servant of God. Afterwards the name was given to other ascetic solitaries, who, though not a religious order in the proper sense of the word, still formed communities of anchorites, living apart, but yet frequently meeting in the same church for devotional purposes and recognizing a common superior. Later on members of the secular clergy formed themselves into somewhat similar communities, and came to be known by the same name. They were in reality, however, what is known as Canons Secular—that is, a body of secular clergy living apart, but subject to a common rule, which was generally the rule of St. Augustin. The Cella De of the earlier period divided his time between prayer, manual labor and literary employment. He was never a burden to others, for he and his brethren contrived to procure from their little farms not only their own scant and meagre fare, but also the means of hospitable entertainment for the poor and the stranger. (Archbishop Healy, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars," p. 405.) In this connection it may be noted that the monastic clergy of St. Patrick's time bound themselves by vows to cultivate the deserts in which they lived for the use of the poor. Their successors gave up the reclaimed lands for the joint benefit of the indigent. Hence we find so many commons in the neighborhood of monasteries.

²¹ Father Cahill, of Dublin, who got an episcopal ring made for him, was prosecuted by the Government and sent to prison, from which he escaped.

ceasingly for ten years to defeat his efforts, and at the end of that decade it was found that the Catholic population of the see had multiplied, that chapels had been erected in every direction and that the tide of conversions was flowing Romewards.

His successor, Edmund O'Reilly, a Dublin priest, was succeeded in turn by the martyred Primate, Oliver Plunkett, a near relative of the Earl of Fingal, whose saintly life and holy and heroic death at Tyburn in 1681 shed additional lustre upon the see. He is one of the Irish martyrs whose beatification is at present under the consideration of the Congregation of Rites, and it is quite within the range of probability that, like some of his predecessors in the Primacy, he will before long be raised to the honors of the altars. His head, enclosed in a shrine, is in custody of the Dominican nuns of Siena Convent, Drogheda. Primate Maguire, who followed him in the perilous penal times, had to go into exile and died in Paris. After his flight no Primate was resident in Armagh for twenty-three years. Hugh MacMahon, translated from Kilmore in 1714 by a decree of Propaganda, died in Dublin in August, 1737, and was outlawed. Upon his accession he drew attention in an elaborate report to Propaganda to the terrible condition of the diocese, rent by internal schism in face of the persecution to which it was subjected by the operation of the penal code, and four years later informed the Internuncio of the consternation caused in Ireland by the arrest of the Archbishop of Dublin. Letters are extant from the Primate to the Cardinals of Propaganda in 1720-21, in which he relates the difficulties under which he wrote his great work, "*Jus Primatiale Armacanum*,"²² difficulties created not only by Protestant persecutors, but by false brethren, who for the sake of the reward²³ offered for the apprehension of a Catholic Bishop were watching all the roads and searching for him everywhere. He was obliged to wander from place to place, often saying Mass and administering confirmation in the open air or in a deserted limekiln or in the solitude of a wood or sequestered valley, for, except in Louth, he had scarcely a chapel in the whole of his diocese. What the Protestants contemptuously called "Papist Mass-houses" were described by one of them (Dr. Browne) as "no more

²² Written in reply to an anonymous pamphlet by John Hennessy, a Jesuit of Clonmel, and which in a brief from the Pope he was directed to have published.

²³ On February 28, 1744, the then Viceroy, the Duke of Devonshire, issued a proclamation commanding magistrates to hunt out the clergy, offering an increased reward for the apprehension and conviction of priests and Bishops. The sum of £50 was hitherto the highest price paid for catching a Bishop and £20 for a priest; £150 more was added to the former and £50 to the latter reward, while £200 was offered for the conviction of whoever should harbor them.

'than open cabins." A poem in the Irish language, written in 1738 by Patrick O'Prunty, a local rhymster, on the occasion of Primate Bernard MacMahon—near relative and successor of Hugh MacMahon—going to live at Ballymacscanlan, in the neighborhood of Dundalk, fervidly eulogizes one of those prelates who, despite all the terrorism of the penal laws, continued to watch over their flocks:

Of welcomes ninety millions I give to thee
Who comest with Christ's symbol in thy hand;
Gifted with wisdom and with power supreme
To rule and judge the myriads of our land.

A glorious tree thou art, dispensing shade,
Sprung from the noble root of Heremon;
True essence of the best blood of the Gaels,
Whose sceptre ruled our soil in days long gone.

Rich jewel of the Church of Innisfall,
Successor of St. Patrick, psalmist sweet,
Whose voice is loudest in the sacred choirs,
Praising the Lord in strains most exquisite.

This Primate wrote to Dr. Linegar, Archbishop of Dublin, on November 7, 1741, telling him that four bailiffs had been hunting for him and that he had been obliged to leave his usual place of safety. Ross MacMahon, a nephew of Hugh MacMahon, after filling the Primacy for one year, died in 1748. His successor, Primate Michael O'Reilly, soon after his translation from Derry—a diocese which suffered more, perhaps, from persecution than any other in Ireland²⁴—was arrested along with eighteen of his priests in the neighborhood of Dundalk for the sole offense of meeting together, which at that time was construed into a crime. They were, however, set at liberty after being closely examined by Limerick, when it was found that they had only met for the purpose of regulating about holidays lately retrenched and receiving the sacred oils. Information having been laid against him that he was collecting funds to set the Pretender on the throne, the Viceroy directed Lord Limerick to have the Primate arrested and lodged in prison, where he was detained till, having been found to be wholly innocent of the imputed crime, he was discharged. Cardinal Moran was shown in the neighborhood of Termonfeckin a small thatched house in which the Primate had lived, and under the thatch a narrow loft formed of the dry branches of trees, where at times he used to lie concealed while the priest-hunters were in close pursuit. A short distance from the hut, at a spot

²⁴ During the whole of the seventeenth century it was bereft of a Bishop, owing to the virulent spirit of the Scotch and English planters and the systematic extirpation of the Catholic proprietary and population. From 1601, when Bishop Redmond O'Gallagher shed his blood for the faith, Derry had seen no Bishop of its own until 1739.

where the main road crosses a little stream, tradition tells that he remained bent under the arch and up to his knees in water while a troop of military, scouring the country in search of him, were galloping along the road.

Primate Anthony Blake could never be prevailed upon to reside permanently in his diocese, and as soon as his visitations were over, returned to Galway. The chapel which served his successor, Primate Richard O'Reilly, called the Angel of Peace, as a pro-cathedral was outside Westgate, Drogheda, for Catholic chapels, when tolerated at all, were only allowed outside the walls of a town. The Primate, however, broke through this unjust and bigoted exclusion and laid the foundation stone of a church inside the walls. The Protestant Mayor and Corporation, wearing their robes and having the mace and sword borne before them, forbade the Primate to proceed further, warned him that it was against the law and threatened to take legal measures of prevention if he continued the ceremonies. Lord Bellew, of Barmeth, a Catholic, in hot indignation jumped forward and harangued the Protestant Councillors in such terms that the Corporation withdrew, and nothing more was heard of the opposition.²⁵ It was the little rift in the clouds, the first streak of light heralding the dawn of a better day. The lot of Dr. Curtis, who succeeded to the Primacy in 1819, was cast in happier times. He lived to witness the daybreak of Catholic Emancipation when Daniel O'Connell—the greatest Catholic leader that Ireland or, perhaps, any country produced—achieved his famous bloodless victory. Even before that a change had come over the country. The spirit which inspired the penal laws had so far passed or was passing away that after Dr. Curtis' consecration the Protestant Corporation presented him with the freedom of the town in a gold box. He got permission to erect a bell in his church, another concession which marked an altered phase of feeling, for until then no bell or steeple was allowed to a Catholic chapel, the congregation being brought together by the sound of a hand bell. Born under the shadow of the penal code which weighed like a nightmare upon Catholic Ireland, when Catholics were so completely ignored that the laws did not presume their existence, he took a very active and influential part in the long and strenuous struggle for constitutional liberty and equality. He was a prelate of great distinction, with statesmanlike breadth and grasp of mind, and was greatly esteemed by the Duke of Wellington, to whom he had rendered signal service during the Peninsular War. He and Dr. Doyle—the famous Bishop of Kildare—were the first Irish Bishops to join the Catholic Association. He passed away

²⁵ The church, which cost £20,000, was opened in December, 1793.

in 1832 and was succeeded by Dr. Thomas Kelly, who was only forty-three years of age, when, after a brief tenure of the Primacy, he died a martyr to charity, having caught the fever in ministering to a soldier in the barracks. In holiness of life he was a fitting successor to so many saintly prelates who preceded him. In manner he was considered austere and reserved and was commonly believed to practice great austerity. He walked every morning to St. Peter's, Drogheda, where he celebrated Mass. As he walked down Lawrence street and along West street, bowed in solemn meditation or absorbed in prayer, his stooped, emaciated form at once attracted attention. The people looked on him as a living saint. He was worn to a thread, and when the doctor who was called in examined him after he became unconscious on the day of his death, he found a coarse hair shirt next to his skin.

The commencement of the building of the new Cathedral, which is a striking evidence of the Church's marvelous resurrection, growth and vitality in the land, was the chief event which distinguished the Primacy of Dr. Crolly. Prior to that the old chapel of St. Malachy, a wretched structure erected in 1750 in an enclosure off Chapel lane, almost on the site of the house where St. Malachy was born, was the sole place of worship possessed by the Catholics of Armagh—an improvement, it is true, on the "Mass gardens" in which their harassed and hunted forefathers, cowering under the lash of the penal laws, had stealthily met to commune with God in prayer and receive the Bread of Life from the trembling hands of some fugitive priest, but wholly inadequate to the needs of the congregation. Dr. Crolly's ambition was to build a cathedral worthy of the city and See of St. Patrick, "the mistress and metropolis of Ireland." The first difficulty he had to overcome was to procure a site. The ground of Armagh city and suburbs consisted almost entirely of "see land," and formed the mensal estate or demesne of the Protestant Primate, with the exception of a noble eminence called Sandy Hill on the north between the Benburb and Charlemont roads, overlooking the entire city and neighborhood. A lease in perpetuity of this was obtained from the landlord, the Earl of Dartrey, and the foundation stone was laid on St. Patrick's Day, 1840, in presence of a vast multitude, such a gathering as had not been witnessed in Armagh for generations. The county roads were as converging torrents that combined to swell a veritable ocean of humanity which, after flooding the ample slopes of Sandy Hill, overflowed the entire city; hundreds, it is said, came and went that day who were never able to get even within sight of the Cathedral foundations.²⁶ Notwithstanding the many and severe

²⁶ "Historical and Descriptive Guide to St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh," p. 6.

trials which he had to endure at the hands of rabid Orangemen²⁷ and the building of a seminary, Dr. Crolly devoted nine laborious years to the prosecution of his great undertaking, until famine and fever in black '47 desolated the land and diverted attention to more pressing needs. On the Good Friday of 1849, he suddenly succumbed to an attack of cholera, then epidemic in Drogheda, whither he had gone from Armagh for the Holy Week ceremonies, and was buried in his own unfinished Cathedral in a vaulted tomb in the crypt beneath the centre of the choir, the first Primate laid to rest in Armagh since the days of Brian Boru, for during a period of nearly three hundred years, since the time of Queen Mary, a Catholic Bishop dared not approach within three miles of, much less live in the Primatial city, where he was the first to resume residence. During the Primacy of Dr. Cullen, who succeeded after nearly a year's interregnum, nothing was done in furtherance of the project, and for five years the low outline of its naked walls stood lonely and neglected, till the Catholics of Armagh began to fear that their great undertaking was about to degenerate into that saddest monument of blasted hopes, an unfinished ruin.²⁸ It was, however, successfully and strenuously resumed by Dr. Dixon, who is regarded as its second founder and who, before he died, had the satisfaction of seeing almost completed (the two western spires alone excepted) the whole grand exterior edifice. The advancing years and precarious health of his successor, Primate Kieran, interposed another obstacle to the progress of the work which it fell to the lot of Dr. McGettigan, translated by Pius IX. from Raphoe to Armagh in 1870, to take vigorously in hand. After completing the two principal spires, decorating the still bare and naked interior, putting in at his own expense the eastern stained glass window, with its inscription to the merits and memory of Primates Crolly and Dixon, ornamenting the Lady Chapel and roof of the choir with fine mural paintings and erecting the grand entrance and an imposing seven-terraced flight of steps leading to the spacious piazza fronting the western doors,²⁹ the Cathedral was solemnly dedicated on August 24, 1873, in presence of an assemblage of about twenty thousand people gathered within and

²⁷ On July 12, 1845, a serious riot took place in Armagh, on the occasion of an Orange procession, when an inoffensive Catholic was brutally murdered. The Primate headed the funeral, which was a manifestation of public indignation against the Government that had left the Catholics at the mercy of a band of armed desperadoes. During a sermon on the following Sunday he alluded to the crime, denouncing the perpetrator and weeping copiously as he proceeded.

²⁸ "Guide," p. 7.

²⁹ Most, if not all, of these, it was eventually discovered, the Primate paid for himself.

outside. A former Primate, Cardinal Cullen—the first Irish churchman ever raised to the dignity of membership of the Sacred College—presided, and the dedication sermon was preached by the great Dominican pulpit orator, Father Tom Burke, the Irish Lacordaire, in place of Cardinal Manning, who was to have delivered the discourse, but was unable, through illness, to fulfill his engagement. The expenditure on the Cathedral up to the end of Dr. McGettigan's episcopate has been roughly estimated at £70,000.

Finis coronat opus. Cardinal Logue has crowned all his predecessors' work and his own by the purchase of Lord Dartrey's interest in the site and the adjoining grounds, seven acres in extent; the complete and perfect renovation of the interior decorations; and the big bazaar of 1900, which netted £30,000—beating the world's records of bazaars—an achievement worthy of the popular prelate who, when Bishop of Raphoe, collected in one year nearly as large an amount for the relief of the distressed peasantry of Donegal. His Eminence may well say, with Horace, *Exegi monumentum ære perennius*. The noble Gothic fane which dominates and adorns the old Primatial city, historic Armagh, will be an enduring memorial of the tireless energy and great zeal of the Cardinal Primate whose name will be writ large in the annals of the Irish Church.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

CHURCH AND STATE.

VIII.

THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN.

COUNT JUSTINIAN, whose zeal for the orthodox faith had proved so important a factor in bringing to an end the Acacian schism, was elevated April, 527, to the rank of Emperor, and the following August, by the death of his uncle, became sole ruler of the empire. His accession to the throne gave the greatest satisfaction to the orthodox party, whose cause had suffered not a little from the heretical leanings of Zeno, Basiliscus and Anastasius. His religious views at this time left nothing to be desired, and his reign opened with a vigorous campaign against heresy and immorality. The great and partially successful efforts, too, which he subsequently made for the reconquest of those portions of the empire that had fallen under the rule of the Northern

barbarians were in no small degree influenced by his pious desire for the spread of the true faith, and his ardor in the same cause initiated many successful missions to still unconverted peoples, both within and without the empire. His reign was destined to be one of the most glorious in history. The conquests of his two famous generals, Belisarius and Narses, who overthrew the Vandal and Gothic kingdoms in Africa and Italy; the remarkable work accomplished by his jurists; the magnificence of his constructions, chief among them the basilica of St. Sophia, are achievements almost any one of which would have given sufficient lustre to a reign.

Yet, unfortunately, there was another side to the picture. In the first place, the Emperor's passion for sumptuous edifices caused the greatest hardships to his people, who had to bear the cost. His predilection for theological controversy was still more fruitful of undesirable consequences; it has always been a rather difficult matter to convince royal theologians, who, from Constantine the Great to Henry VIII., have been only too ready to employ the argument of physical force when all other attempts to convince failed. However, in the year of our Lord 527 the prospects of the orthodox Christians seemed generally bright. The best of relations existed between Rome and Constantinople; only the previous year Pope John I., visiting the imperial city as ambassador of King Theodoric, had been received by the Emperor with the highest honors. At this time, too, Justinian fully acknowledged the distinction between civil and religious authority and regarded himself, in the character of Bishop-Exterior, as the executor of the Church's disciplinary laws. His recognition of the Pope's universal authority left nothing to be desired. Writing to Pope John II. (533-535), for instance, he speaks warmly of his devotion to the Apostolic See, as well as to His Holiness personally, whom, as is becoming, he esteems as a father. Everything that regards religion he hastens to bring to the notice of the Pope, and he has also seen to it that all the Eastern Bishops shall both be united with and subject to the Pope, who is the head of all the churches.¹

Nor was this acknowledgment of the Pope's authority confined wholly, in the early part of Justinian's reign, to the sphere of theory; on at least one occasion the supreme jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was asserted and admitted by the Emperor, in a case of great moment, in his own imperial capital. The circum-

¹ Reddentes honorem Apostolicæ sedi et vestrae Sanctitati. quod semper in voto et fuit et est, et ut decet Patrem honorantes vestram beatitudinem: Omnia quæ ad ecclesiarum statum pertinent festinavimus ad notitiam deferre vestrae Sanctitati. . . . Ideoque omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus et subijcere et unire sedi vestrae sanctitatis properavimus, . . . quæ caput est omnium SS. ecclesiarum. Cod. Justin., L. 8, I. 1.

stances were as follows: Shortly after his elevation to the Pontifical throne (535) Pope Agapetus was strongly urged by the Gothic King Theodahad to undertake in his behalf a mission to Constantinople. Though reluctant to do so, the Pope had really no choice in the matter, since the Gothic ruler had threatened that, should Agapetus refuse to intervene in his behalf with Justinian, Theodahad would order the execution of the Roman Senators, with their wives and children. Accordingly, the Pope set out for Constantinople, where he arrived early in the year 536.

The political errand of Agapetus met with no success, for the mind of Justinian was firmly set on the reconquest of Italy, which, as a matter of fact, the Pope and the Romans desired as ardently as the Emperor. But in the ecclesiastical order the visit of Agapetus to the East was destined to be of the greatest importance. The See of Constantinople was just then ruled by the Patriarch Anthimus, formerly Bishop of Trebizond, who, through the influence of the Empress Theodora, had recently been advanced to the episcopal throne of the capital. Anthimus, while pretending to be orthodox, was secretly a monophysite, to which circumstance he owed his favor with the Empress. When the Pope reached Constantinople these facts were made known to him by the orthodox clergy, with the result that he refused to communicate with Anthimus, first, because of the suspicion of heresy, and, secondly, because transfers from one see to another were strictly forbidden by the canons.

This attitude incurred the grave displeasure of Justinian, who endeavored by intimidation to bring Agapetus to his way of thinking. "Either comply with my request or I will cause thee to be carried away into banishment," he threatened. To which the Pope replied, "I who am but a sinner came with eager longing to gaze upon the most Christian Emperor Justinian. In his place I find a Diocletian, whose threats do not in the least terrify me." In justice to Justinian it must be said that up to this moment he had had no suspicion of the orthodoxy of Anthimus, so that when Agapetus suggested that the Patriarch should be questioned as to his belief, the Emperor without hesitation accepted the proposal. Anthimus was directed accordingly to appear before the Pope, who interrogated him on the subject of the two natures. His answers established his unorthodoxy, and in consequence he was deposed by the Pope and exiled by the Emperor. His successor, Mennas, was consecrated by Agapetus in the basilica of St. Mary.

In this striking manner did a Pope successfully assert his supreme authority over the Bishop of the imperial city, and his right

to do so was in the clearest terms admitted by one of the most arbitrary of the Roman emperors.² Within a month after the consecration of Mennas, however, the aged Pope died in Constantinople (April 22, 536), which event ended the satisfactory relations of the Church and the empire for the remainder of the reign of Justinian.

For the religious troubles of Justinian's reign no small share of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Empress Theodora. Theodora was an ardent monophysite, who openly protected her co-religionists, in spite of the fact that the Emperor was carrying on a vigorous campaign against these sectaries. The deposition of her protégé, Anthimus, in the circumstances, by Pope Agapetus, caused her the utmost chagrin, but as Roman influence at this time was paramount in the capital, for the moment she had to accept defeat. The death of the Pope, however, gave her the opportunity for which she waited, and with the unscrupulousness to be expected from one of her antecedents, she boldly resolved to secure the Papacy for the cause she so warmly espoused. Her plan was simple and, humanly speaking, likely to be effective; with the coöperation of Belisarius, then master of the Eternal City, she resolved to place in the chair of St. Peter a man devoid of scruples, who, in return for the great prize, would receive the monophysites into communion.

The person selected to carry out this project was the Roman deacon Vigilius, who at the death of Pope Agapetus held the office of Apocrisarius, or Papal Nuncio, at the imperial court. Vigilius was the scion of a Senatorial family of Rome and son of a former Consul. He had long entertained the hope of ascending the Papal throne, and had nearly succeeded in attaining his wish some years earlier, when he had been solemnly designated by Boniface II. as his successor; Boniface himself had been designated in the same manner by Felix IV. But the indignation aroused among the Roman clergy by this second attempt of a Pope to nominate his successor became so pronounced that Boniface was compelled, before the Confession of St. Peter, to acknowledge that in this matter he had done wrong,³ and, in presence of the clergy and Senate, to destroy the decree of nomination. After this humiliating check the chances of Vigilius of obtaining the object of his ambition by legitimate means became remote, but he still had influence enough to obtain the important office of Nuncio at Constantinople.

² Qui quidem dejectus est de sede hujus regiae urbis a sanctae et gloriosae memoriae Agapeto SS. ecclesiae antiquae Romae pontifice. Nov. 42. Praef.; Liber Pontificalis (ed. Duchesne) I. 283.

³ Ipse Bonifatius papa reum se confessus est majestatis. Liber Pontif. I. 281.

Probably Theodora knew something of this episode in the previous history of Vigilius, or at all events she knew sufficient of the man to feel confident that if she could make him Pope he would carry out her wishes. A bargain was accordingly entered into between the Empress and the deacon, in which it was stipulated that if Vigilius should, with the help of Theodora, become the successor of Pope Agapetus, he in return would comply with all her demands in favor of the monophysites.

With letters for Belisarius containing the instructions of the Empress, Vigilius hurried to Italy, only to find on his arrival in Rome that the Papal chair was already occupied by the newly selected Pope Silverius. But Vigilius was not to be balked by this obstacle. A charge of treason was trumped up against Silverius; he was accused of having written a letter promising to open the Asinarian gate, near the Lateran, to the Goths, and as he refused to comply with the suggestion of Belisarius to do himself what Vigilius had promised the Empress, he was seized and carried into exile. A graphic account of the seizure of Silverius is given by the *Liber Pontificalis*. The Pope, who, at the time of this crisis in his life, lived at the Church of St. Sabina, on the Aventine, was invited to visit Belisarius in his palace on the Pincian, and, contrary to the advice of his friends, who warned him against the treacherous character of the Greeks, accepted the invitation. On his arrival at the palace the Pope was, first of all, separated from his attendants, and then, accompanied by Vigilius alone, he was ushered into the presence of Belisarius and his wife, Antonia. The latter, who was a close friend of Theodora, opened the tragedy, pretending to be indignant, with the query: "Tell us, Lord Pope Silverius, what have we done to thee and the Romans that thou shouldst wish to betray us into the hands of the Goths?" Before he could reply the Papal pallium was removed from the shoulders of Silverius, after which he was led into a private apartment and clothed in the garb of a monk. This done, the Sub-Deacon Sixtus went outside and announced to the waiting clergy that "the Lord Pope is deposed and made a monk." Silverius was then taken in charge by Vigilius and subsequently exiled to Patara, in Lycia.

When the exiled Pope reached his destination he was received with the greatest kindness and consideration by the Bishop of Patara, who also intervened in his behalf with Justinian. "Of the many kings who reign in the world," wrote the Bishop to the Emperor, "not one has suffered so cruel reverses as this man, who as Pope is over the whole Church." Justinian, who was probably unaware of the plot whereof Silverius was the victim, took imme-

ciate cognizance of this appeal and gave instructions that the accusations against the Pope should be investigated. Nothing was really done, however, except that Silverius was, by order of Vigilius, removed from Patara to the desolate island of Palmaria, where he died, June 21, 538.

Silverius thus disposed of and Vigilius seated on the Papal throne, no further obstacle to the triumph of the monophysites seemed to remain. Curiously enough, however, Vigilius, now that the object of his ambition was attained, began to entertain scruples relative to the promises he had made the Empress. The chair of Peter appeared to have changed his character, and he remained deaf to the remonstrances of Belisarius relative to the carrying out of his agreement with Theodora. It is true, indeed, that a letter at this time was circulated, purporting to be addressed by Vigilius to the monophysite chiefs Anthimus, Severus and Theodosius, expressing views bordering on monophysitism. The authenticity of this document is, however, regarded as more than doubtful, whereas, on the other hand, the profession of faith sent by Vigilius to Mennas of Constantinople and the Emperor is rigidly orthodox. The author of the life of this Pope in the *Liber Pontificalis* even represents Vigilius as writing to the Empress emphatically declining to restore the deposed Anthimus, whom he stigmatizes as a heretic under anathema. He admits that formerly he spoke foolishly in this matter and that his actions have been inconsistent, but now he feels confident he is doing right, seeing that he is following in the footsteps of his holy predecessors, Apapetus and—Silverius!

Thus did the plan of the Empress for the moment completely fail of its purpose. But Theodora was not the sort of person to forget or pardon a slight. Years passed away, during which Vigilius remained undisturbed, a circumstance largely due, it is supposed, to the great influence exercised over Justinian by the Nuncio at Constantinople, the able Roman Deacon Pelagius. In this interval of comparative quiet Justinian was laboring zealously for orthodoxy and his wife with equal zeal and more success in the cause of heresy. The empire thus presented the curious spectacle of the Emperor strenuously endeavoring to extirpate monophysitism, while at the same time the Empress was employing every means at her disposal to frustrate his designs, going so far, even, as openly to protect and patronize the monophysite chiefs prescribed by her imperial consort.

Matters remained in this unsettled condition until the year 543, when an imprudent act of the Nuncio Pelagius precipitated a new religious conflict, the so-called "Three Chapters Controversy." To understand the origin of the Three Chapters question a resumé of the

antecedent facts bearing on the subject will here be necessary. In the early days of his nunciature, which began in 536, Pelagius, high in the favor of the Emperor, had set his mind to the difficult task of finding a way to bring back the Church of Alexandria to orthodoxy. The circumstances at this time seemed more than ordinarily favorable for an attempt of this nature, as the monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy IV., had just died. Two candidates for the succession were soon in the field—one, named Gainos, an extreme monophysite; the other, Theodosius, who, although an adherent of the heresy, was yet esteemed a person of moderate views and likely to prove amenable to reason. As the best means to the desired end, consequently, it was resolved at Constantinople that the candidacy of the latter should receive official support, and in due time Theodosius, to the accompaniment of a certain amount of rioting, was enthroned at Alexandria.

But Theodosius proved a disappointment, for when summoned to Constantinople two years later (538) and asked to accept the Council of Chalcedon, he declined to do so. The baffled Emperor thereupon sent him into exile. A more accommodating successor to the deposed Patriarch was then sought and found by Pelagius in the person of a monk of Egyptian origin named Paul, who was consecrated at Constantinople by the Patriarch Mennas. The new head of the Alexandrine Church arrived in Egypt in 540, with full powers to reestablish orthodoxy.

But two years of violent rule exhausted the mandate of Paul, and his conduct became such that he was deposed by a synod held at Gaza in 542. Pelagius took the leading part in the proceedings of the synod, and once more the Papal Nuncio selected a Patriarch of Alexandria, his choice falling on a certain ecclesiastic named Zoilus.

But the voyage of Pelagius to Gaza was destined to produce other results of much greater moment than the choice of a Patriarch of Alexandria. "The journey to Gaza," says Mgr. Duchesne, "brought Pelagius into relations with the monks of Palestine, pious and orthodox personages, who, eager to find themselves at one on the question of the Incarnation, had sought and found another capital subject of debate in the doctrine of Origen. It was a God-send; on this question they were sure never to agree." At the date of the Synod of Gaza the pro-Origenists seem to have had the upper hand in this local controversy; whereupon the anti-Origenists, remembering that the great Alexandrian doctor had never been held in favor at Rome, approached Pelagius with a view to obtaining his influence in their behalf. The Nuncio became an easy victim, who, on his return to Constantinople, eagerly took up the

matter with the Emperor and the Patriarch Mennas. Justinian was always delighted with an opportunity of displaying his theological knowledge, and accordingly responded to the appeal from the Orient with a long edict, which concluded with the condemnation by the Imperial Pontiff of ten propositions taken from the writings of Origen. The Emperor further directed Mennas to hold a *sunodos endemousa* on the subject of Origen, and issued orders that in future all candidates for the offices of Bishop and Archimandrite should add a condemnation of the great Alexandrian to the anathemas already customary.

Pelagius, no doubt, congratulated himself on his success on this occasion, and seems to have forgotten that the Roman Church, which he represented, had more than once protested in strong terms against the usurpation by emperors of Papal prerogatives. But the Nuncio lived long enough to regret bitterly having raised again the Origenist question. For Origen had many and powerful friends in the Orient, who strongly resented the condemnation of their revered master, and only awaited a fitting occasion to repay the author of their momentary discomfiture. The most important of these pro-Origenists was the clever, and at court influential, Archbishop of Cæsarea, Theodore Askidas. For the time being, however, Theodore bent to the storm. He had no idea of becoming a martyr to his conviction, and consequently, when the Emperor condemned Origen, the Archbishop, with the usual Oriental facility in such matters, signed the condemnation. This done, he sought a means to turn the tables on Pelagius, and found what he sought, easily enough, in certain writings of three personages whose names had figured prominently in the Christological controversies of the previous century.

These three personages were Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius; Theodoret of Cyr, the friend and for a long time the ardent defender of the former Archbishop of Constantinople, and Ibas of Edessa. At the date of the Council of Chalcedon (451) the first of this trio was dead, but Theodoret and Ibas were alive and took part in the proceedings of the council, where they unhesitatingly condemned the teaching of Nestorius. Their orthodoxy being thus satisfactorily established, the colleagues at Chalcedon of Theodoret and Ibas tacitly agreed to drop all minor issues in their regard; whatever either of these Bishops might have said in the heat of controversy of a more or less compromising character was now, in the interest of harmony, forever committed to oblivion. But the moderate Bishops of Chalcedon had counted without the future Archbishop of Cæsarea, Theodore Askidas. Theodore's point of view was quite simple. If, he argued, so much is now

made by the official representative in the East of the Roman Church of the supposedly erroneous teaching of a great Christian apologist, who died three centuries ago, what about the errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the father of Nestorianism, and of Theodoret and Ibas, the opponents of St. Cyril, which were passed over by the legates of Pope Leo the Great at the Council of Chalcedon? Did not these also deserve to be anathematized, at least as much as Origen? Moreover, the Archbishop explained to the Emperor, it is precisely the exculpation of these three Bishops which is the greatest obstacle to unity; condemn them with their writings and the monophysites will return *en masse* to the communion of the Church.

The plausibility of this point of view appealed to Justinian, and, besides, the new opportunity presented to the imperial theologian for dogmatizing was irresistible; what a triumph for him should he succeed in closing the breach that for nearly a century had separated orthodox from monophysites. There was, indeed, an obstacle in the way in the fact that the Bishops whose reputations the Emperor now proposed to sacrifice had escaped censure and been restored to their sees by an œcumenical council. But the plan of Theodore Askidas did not contemplate any general condemnation of the trio in question; all that was necessary, he declared, was the disapproval of certain of their writings and the result aimed at would be attained.

This argument turned the scale with Justinian, whose desire for Christian unity grew more intense daily. Indeed, the situation in the Orient was really alarming, and was soon to become more so owing to the enormous success in establishing a distinctively monophysite Church, achieved a few years later by the famous organizer of the Jacobite denomination, James Baradeus. This remarkable man was consecrated Bishop of Edessa at Constantinople, in 543, by some refugee monophysite Bishops living in the capital under the protection of the Empress, and from this date to the end of his life all his energies were devoted to the monophysite cause. The result of his labors must have been highly satisfactory to his co-believers; in the decade following his elevation to the episcopate he established a schismatical Church, with twenty-five Bishops and more than 100,000 priests and deacons. These figures furnish abundant evidence of the futility of Justinian's plan of reconciling the monophysites, for his first edict condemning the Three Chapters was published in the year (543) of the consecration of Baradeus.

The term "Three Chapters," as first employed by the Emperor Justinian, referred to the three *capitula* or chapters in which his

decision on the subject was formulated. Subsequently, however, this phrase was transferred from the divisions of the edict to their object, namely, (1), the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2), the writings of Theodoret in favor of Nestorius and against the Council of Ephesus, and, (3), the letter of Ibas to the Persian Bishop Maris. All of these persons or things were anathematized in 543 by the head of the Roman State, and thus was precipitated a new conflict in Christendom.

For the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon objected in the strongest terms to the opening anew of issues which, they maintained, the great council had definitely settled. It was, indeed, admitted by this party that the condemned writings contained much that was objectionable, and everybody knew that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the intellectual parent of Nestorianism. In 435, for example, Theodore had been denounced by Rabboula, Bishop of Edessa, and the justice of the denunciation was then recognized by St. Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople. Yet these two dignitaries refrained from anathematizing Theodore, for the reason that some of those who controverted his teaching did so from a monophysite standpoint, and thus objected to opinions of the Bishop of Mopsuestia, which were wholly orthodox. This confusion placed St. Cyril and Proclus in a dilemma, for whereas they were about to condemn Theodore as a Nestorian, they were now called upon to defend him against the monophysites. After due consideration and seeing that Theodore had long ago died in the communion of the Church, the two Patriarchs decided to take no action at all in the circumstances, and an edict of Theodosius II. recommended all parties to drop the subject.

As regards the two others concerned in the edict of Justinian, Theodoret and Ibas, they also, it was admitted, had said regrettable things. Theodoret had spoken harshly of St. Cyril, yet at Chalcedon he had subscribed the condemnation of Nestorius and was restored to his diocese. Ibas, too, had written in violent terms of St. Cyril, and certain portions of his letter to Maris were deserving of condemnation. But at the same time this very document contained proofs that Ibas was thoroughly orthodox in his belief, which fact being recognized by the fathers of Chalcedon, he also was restored to his see. Furthermore, Ibas had previously, at the Synod of Tyre, retracted all that was objectionable in his letter, and, subsequently, without hesitation, condemned Nestorius.

The objections of the orthodox, therefore, to the edict of Justinian were, in brief, that the Emperor was meddling with matters disposed of by an œcumenical council of the Church, whose decisions in this regard, and no matter what he might pretend to the

contrary, he was endeavoring to overthrow. But the Emperor was determined to have his own way, and having chosen his position, he began to employ all the powers absolutism placed at his disposal to compel the Bishops of Christendom to submit to his will.

The first to accept the edict was Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, though only on condition that, should the Pope refuse to approve, his signature should be regarded as withdrawn. The Patriarch of Alexandria, Zoilus, as well as Ephraim of Antioch and Peter of Jerusalem, at first protested and resisted, but finally yielded to the Emperor's command, before the threat of deposition. The Eastern Patriarchs thus won, the Bishops of their jurisdiction, with few exceptions, followed their example. Mennas of Constantinople, forgetting his own conditional signature, showed particular zeal in obtaining signatures, and went so far as to employ force with the Bishops of his patriarchate who exhibited any symptoms of opposition. The Papal Nuncio Stephen, successor of Pelagius, and the Archbishop of Milan, Datius, who just then happened to be in Constantinople, protested against the violent measures of the Patriarch. But their remonstrances passed unheeded, and in consequence the two Western dignitaries broke off relations with Mennas.

Having thus with comparatively little trouble succeeded in the East, Justinian next turned his attention to the West, where the real difficulty was to be anticipated. When the edict of condemnation reached Rome its purport was communicated by the Archdeacon Pelagius, the former Nuncio, to the Archbishop of Carthage, who was asked his opinion on the subject. The Archbishop's reply was one of unqualified disapproval; the general acceptance of the edict, he wrote, would be the end of the authority of œcumenical councils. This also was the unanimous opinion at Rome and throughout the West.

The Emperor, however, was not in the least moved by the opposition of the Latin Church, which he resolved to overcome. To attain this end, however, he must have the Pope on his side, and accordingly orders were issued that Vigilius should be sent, a prisoner if necessary, to Constantinople. According to the "*Liber Pontificalis*," it was really the Empress who was responsible for the seizure of Vigilius; evidently Theodora had not forgotten nor forgiven the failure of the man she had raised to the Pontifical throne several years earlier to fulfill his share of their discreditable compact.

At all events, "Anthemius the scribe" set out for Rome with instructions to arrest Vigilius anywhere, save in the basilica of

St. Peter, and to stimulate his zeal, Theodora, we are told, had sworn "by Him who liveth forever" that should he return without the Pope, the gentle Empress would have him flayed alive. When the officer arrived at his destination, November 22, 545, he found the city en fête celebrating the Pope's birthday. Vigilius, he learned, was just then in the basilica of St. Cæcilia, whither Anthemius hastened and, taking the Pope into custody, proceeded to the ship waiting in the Tiber, followed by a large concourse of weeping people, who asked the prayers of the illustrious prisoner. The moment the ship drew off from shore, however, the Pope's enemies in the crowd revealed their sentiments towards him, and with the courage born of certain impunity these brave Romans now hurled all manner of missiles and abuse after the latest and most highly placed ecclesiastical victim of imperial tyranny. Such was the first reward of the Roman Church for her fidelity to the idea of the Roman Empire. For some unknown reason Anthemius did not proceed directly to Constantinople with his prisoner, but disembarked at Catania, in Sicily, where the Pope was detained for the next ten months. Here Vigilius proved that among his failings was not a want of magnanimity; early in 546 he dispatched to Rome, then besieged by the Goths, a fleet of corn ships for the relief of the people, whose cry, "Hunger go with thee!" had rung in his ears at the time of his departure. At length, January 25, 547, he arrived in Constantinople and was received by the Emperor with all the honors due his position. This preliminary over, the serious business to be transacted between the Pope and the Emperor was introduced. At first Vigilius was very firm in his attitude, which was one of total opposition to the imperial edict; he even at this time excommunicated Mennas, together with the other Eastern Bishops who had accepted the Emperor's condemnation of the Three Chapters, for a period of four months; the Patriarch retorted by excommunicating the Pope for precisely the same period.

After this brave beginning Vigilius entered on the long course of vacillation which lasted until death (555) finally delivered him from the awful burden of the Pontificate he had so eagerly sought and assumed a decade previously. In the first place, the theologians of Constantinople were soon able to convince him that the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were really and seriously, in certain respects, wanting in orthodoxy and that the condemned works of Theodoret and Ibas as well were, from the same point of view, the reverse of edifying. Yet at the same time the Pope was aware that the Council of Chalcedon, knowing as well as he the objectionable character of these writings, had refrained from condemning the so-called Three Chapters. How could he escape the dilemma in which

circumstances had placed him? After reflection Vigilius thought he saw a way out of the difficulty by means of a compromise, but he had sufficient sense of the dignity of his high office to reject the Emperor's demand for his subscription to the edict of condemnation. If needs must that he give way, then he will do so in a manner that will at least be in keeping with his position as head of the Universal Church. This decision was not at all pleasing to Justinian, but neither threats nor blandishments availed, and Vigilius had his way. After various consultations with the ecclesiastics of his suite the Pope, April 11, 548, pronounced judgment on the question at issue in his celebrated *Judicatum*. The two leading features of this document are (1) the condemnation of the Three Chapters, as the Emperor demanded, and (2) an emphatic reservation in favor of the decrees of the four œcumenical councils, particularly those of Chalcedon, and of his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter.⁴

In this way Vigilius thought he had solved the problem of satisfying both the Emperor and the West, but he soon found that his hopes in respect to the latter were ill founded. For the publication of the *Judicatum* was greeted with indignation or regret throughout Latin Christendom. In the entourage of the Pope at Constantinople Datius of Milan and Facundus of Hermiana were dissatisfied, and although at first the Roman members of his suite expressed themselves loudly in favor of the *Judicatum*, subsequently, when these prudent personages saw how the land lay at home, they were just as loud in its condemnation, thus causing Vigilius much trouble. His own nephew, the Deacon Rusticus, and another Roman deacon named Sebastian, took the lead in opposition to their chief, who was thus obliged to depose both of these disloyal attendants from office. A council held at Carthage in 550 was the most emphatic of all in its disapproval of his action, going so far even as to excommunicate him. The Bishops of Illyria and Dalmatia also formally declined to accept the decision of the Pope, while the Bishops of Gaul, as yet not fully aware of the facts, wrote, uneasily, asking for information and received the assurance that on his return to Rome Vigilius would explain everything satisfactorily.

In view of this serious resistance to the *Judicatum* the Pope and the Emperor agreed that it would be advisable to withdraw this unsatisfactory production and refer the question in dispute to the decision of an œcumenical council. The Emperor, however, before this determination had been acted upon, first took the precaution of obtaining from Vigilius a promise under oath that the Pope would aid him by every means in his power to have the

⁴ Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, III, part I., p. 29.

Three Chapters anathematized. This proceeding showed plainly enough the use the Emperor intended to make of the proposed council; it was to be a convenient instrument to carry out his wishes; whereas the Pope, by the engagement entered into, completely deprived himself of all independence of action.

These preliminaries arranged, invitations for a general council, to be held in Constantinople, were issued. How little freedom of discussion the Emperor intended to grant the fathers was soon indicated when the delegates from Africa arrived in the capital. The Eastern Bishops, of course, gave Justinian no anxiety and the Bishops of Illyria refused to attend. But Africa sent four Bishops to represent its ecclesiastical provinces: Reparatus, Archbishop of Carthage; Firmus, Primate of Numidia, and two Bishops from Byzacene, Primasius and Verecundus. On the arrival of these prelates in Constantinople all manner of attentions was shown them, in the hope of winning them over by flattery to the court point of view. But when this method failed of results, intimidation was employed. The Archbishop of Carthage, on the false charge of having caused the death of an imperial general, was deposed and exiled and his place given to his own representative at Constantinople, Primosus. This object-lesson was not without its effect on the remaining African delegates, two of whom subsequently went over to the Emperor's party; Verecundus, Bishop of Junca, alone resisted to the end.

The bad faith of Justinian was still further shown by the next move of the court party. Fearing resistance on the part of the Western Bishops, should these in large numbers attend the council, the Emperor, by the advice of Theodore Askidas and contrary to his promise to the Pope, issued a second edict condemning the Three Chapters; after which began the ordinary procedure in such cases—a demand for episcopal signatures. Vigilius vigorously protested against this new outrage and held a conference of Eastern and Western Bishops at his residence, to determine what action should in the circumstances be taken. At the close of the conference the Pope demanded that the Emperor should withdraw his latest edict, which, Vigilius said, would scandalize the Latin Bishops more than ever and leave the council free to perform the task for which it was convened; he further asked that the Western Bishops should attend the council or at least be permitted to vote thereat by proxy. These demands were put in the form of an ultimatum, and at the same time those who had already subscribed to the edict were excommunicated. Datius of Milan also addressed the Emperor in the same sense. Speaking, he said, for Northern Italy, Gaul, Burgundy and Spain, he felt sure he could say that whosoever accepted

the imperial decree would be excluded from the communion of the Bishops of the countries named.

But Justinian and his chief adviser, Theodore Askidas, declined to grant the demands of the Pope. Theodore, indeed, by his own authority, struck from the diptychs the name of Zoilus of Alexandria and, in concert with Mennas, appointed a person named Appollinaris in his place; for these arbitrary acts Theodore was excommunicated. The situation was now critical, and, fearing for their safety, the Pope and the Archbishop of Milan sought refuge in the basilica of St. Peter (August, 551). Soon afterwards a decree of deposition was drawn up against Mennas, Theodore Askidas and their adherents, but as the Pope still hoped an understanding might be arrived at, this sentence was not published immediately. Justinian, however, had no intention of yielding; on the contrary, by his orders the basilica of St. Peter was invaded by a company of soldiers and an attempt made to arrest the Pope. Vigilius resisted, and being a man of powerful physique, took hold of a column of the altar, from which the soldiers, seizing him by the feet, the head and beard, were unable to dislodge him. In the struggle that followed the column became loose and the table of the altar would have fallen on the Pope had it not been held up by some of his attendants. The sight of this outrage was too much for the people who were spectators, and their attitude became so threatening that the Prætor, with his troops, thought it wise to retreat. Violence having thus failed, Justinian now resorted to the other Byzantine alternative—stratagem. An imposing delegation of courtiers, headed by Belisarius, was sent to reassure Vigilius and to promise him, under oath, that, if he would return to his former residence, his safety would be guaranteed. The Pope agreed and drew up at once an oath in this sense for the Emperor's signature. Justinian, however, refused to sign, but directed that his representatives should do so in his stead. Vigilius accepted this modification, and accordingly the imperial delegation took a solemn oath, on a relic of the True Cross, guaranteeing him liberty of action. Whereupon Vigilius returned with his followers to the Placidian palace.

But the spirit of the convention thus entered into was from the beginning violated by a system of petty persecution. The Pope's servants were corrupted; some even of his clerical attendants proved false and caused him great annoyance. Finally calumnious reports were industriously spread in the West against Vigilius and his fellow-prisoner, the Archbishop of Milan. A notary was even bribed to counterfeit letters, purporting to come from the Pope, which were forwarded to Italy, with the view to discredit their supposed author. Fortunately, at this juncture ambassadors of

Theodobald, King of the Franks, visited Constantinople, and to them was entrusted a letter to the Italian clergy, which contained the correct version of the Three Chapters controversy.

The Placidian palace thus became a prison, all approaches to which were closely guarded. Two days before Christmas (551), however, the Pope succeeded in again effecting his escape, and this time he fled across the strait, where he found an asylum in the basilica of St. Euphemia, in which the Council of Chalcedon had been held a century before. The place of refuge was well chosen, since it strikingly brought home to the popular mind the fact that the Pope was being persecuted because of his fidelity to the great council. The sentence of deposition drawn up six months earlier against Mennas and Theodore Askidas was now published (January, 552). So far as Vigilius was concerned personally, his second asylum was respected, but the Archdeacon and former Nuncio, Pelagius, who had joined his chief at Constantinople, was, with the Deacon Tullianus and several Bishops, dragged off to prison; Verecundus, the African Bishop, who had remained true to the orthodox cause, died in St. Euphemia of the hardships to which he had long been subjected. About a month after the Pope had found a secure defeat at Chalcedon the Emperor again made advances, and Belisarius, with the same delegation who had so solemnly sworn that the Pope's liberty would be respected, again visited Vigilius. But the Pope had had enough of Byzantine oaths and declined a second time to fall in with the imperial wishes. Whereupon Justinian addressed to Vigilius a letter so full of threats and abuse that he was even ashamed to sign his name to the precious document! The Pope replied, February 5, 552, in an encyclical letter to the Catholic world, in which he gave a detailed account of the brutal treatment he had received at the hands of the Emperor and his satellites, lay and clerical. The encyclical also contained a profession of faith, and, in order to offset any bad impression that might have been created by the calumnious reports circulated against him, a clear recognition of the four œcumenical councils. This vigorous action of the Pope, together with the excommunication of Mennas and Theodore Askidas, at once produced a wholesome effect. Moreover, at this date Rome was in the hands of the Gothic King Totila, a fact wholly favorable to the interests of Vigilius, since it rendered an attempt to dispose of him in the manner in which he himself, with imperial assistance, had got rid of his predecessor, out of the question. Negotiations between the contending parties were accordingly resumed, and a profession of faith, entirely satisfactory, was sent to the Pope by Mennas and Theodore. These personages further assured Vigilius that they

anxiously desired the restoration of peace in the Church; that they accepted the four œcumenical councils without reservation, as well as the tome of Pope Leo; and finally they protested their freedom from complicity in the persecutions the Pope had suffered and asked pardon for having held intercourse with excommunicated persons. The Pope accepted these explanations and professions, after which he returned from Chalcedon to Constantinople.

The rest of the year 552 dragged along without anything definite being done towards the settlement of the tedious controversy. In the course of the year the Archbishop of Milan died at Constantinople and Mennas was also called to his reward; the latter was succeeded by the Patriarch Eutychius. The question of a council was again raised and Vigilius consented to its convocation, on condition, however, that the Latin episcopate should be well represented and that it should be held in Italy or Sicily. But the Emperor held out for Constantinople and an overwhelming majority of Eastern Bishops, whereupon the Pope refused his coöperation. Justinian next proposed submitting the issue to a small body of Bishops, composed of an equal number from each party. Vigilius agreed to this, on condition that half the arbitrators should be Latins. But this was not at all the Emperor's idea; he demanded that each of the five Patriarchates should be equally represented, and thus the Latins would be outnumbered four to one. Vigilius naturally refused to accept such a proposal and negotiations were again broken off.

At length the Council of Constantinople opened, May 5, 553, under the presidency of the Patriarch Eutychius; the Pope refused in any way to participate in its discussions. The Emperor, however, did not yet give up all hope of winning over Vigilius, and accordingly, even while the council was in session, repeated efforts were made by the Bishops and the Emperor to induce him to join them. But Vigilius had at last taken a firm stand, and while the council was engaged in carrying out the wishes of Justinian, the Pope was busily occupied in formulating, with the assistance of his Western advisers, his own definite decision on the Three Chapters controversy. This decision was published in Constantinople May 15, 553, with the signatures attached of the Pope, sixteen Western Bishops and three of the Roman clergy. This important pronouncement, known as the *Constitutum*, opens with the statement that its author had carefully examined all the documents bearing on the question and was now in consequence in a position to deal with it on its merits. The position the Pope takes is quite consistent with the attitude of his predecessors and of the council of Chalcedon. It would, of course, he believed, have been much better had the

present issue never been raised. The Council of Chalcedon was perfectly well aware of the objectionable things in the incriminated writings, yet, in the interest of harmony, the fathers of that assemblage had refrained from condemning a man who long ago had died in communion with the Church, and had, moreover, restored to their churches Theodoret and Ibas, after receiving satisfactory assurances that both these Bishops were orthodox in their belief.

Now, however, since so great importance is attached to issues that should have been left in oblivion, Vigilius takes up the Three Chapters, over which the imperial theologians have set the whole Christian world by the ears, and renders judgment on each separately. As regards Theodore, in the first place, the Pope agrees with the Emperor and his advisers that the writings of this personage contain much that deserves censure, and accordingly he condemns some sixty propositions extracted from his works. But he declines to anathematize the *person* of the former Bishop of Mopsuestia, on the ground that such a condemnation was against all Roman precedent. The Council of Ephesus, says the Pope, condemned a profession of faith attributed to Theodore, as charged with error, but refrained from condemning Theodore himself. This moderation was imitated by the Council of Chalcedon. Moreover, two predecessors of Vigilius, Gelasius and Leo, had expressly pronounced against condemnations of the dead. These Popes, Vigilius declares, had decreed that the dead should be left to the judgment of God; therefore, he, following the example thus laid down, will neither condemn nor permit to be condemned a man who died in communion with the Church.

As to Theodoret of Cyr, Vigilius fails to understand why so great efforts have been made to dishonor the memory of a Bishop who had at Chalcedon established his orthodoxy and had besides condemned Nestorianism in terms accepted as satisfactory by the six hundred or more fathers of that council. Nor will it do to say in excuse for the procedure now advocated by the Emperor that the Council of Chalcedon would never have approved of the harsh things said by Theodoret against the anathematisms of St. Cyril. At Chalcedon Theodoret had accepted the *doctrine* of St. Cyril, which was the important matter, and the fathers of Chalcedon, following in this the magnanimity of St. Cyril himself, had allowed the question of his writings to remain at rest. Nevertheless, since the question of erroneous doctrine supposed to have been taught by Theodoret has been raised, and since writings of this character are passing round under the name of Theodoret, Vigilius condemns these writings. But he does not and will not condemn Theodoret.

The same principle held for the case of Ibas of Edessa. The

profession of faith presented by Ibas at Chalcedon was pronounced orthodox by such men as the Papal legates, Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch, and the judgment of these leaders was accepted by the council as its own. Of course, it went without saying that the council had not approved the attacks of Ibas upon St. Cyril, but as a matter of fact Ibas had himself expressed regret for having said in the heat of controversy unwarranted things of the former Patriarch of Alexandria. Which being the case, no further action is now necessary as regards Ibas; his letter was accepted and his person respected by the Council of Chalcedon; this must suffice, declares Vigilius, for all Catholics. The *Constitutum* concludes with a prohibition to all ecclesiastics against writing or teaching anything in contradiction with this decision of the Roman Pontiff.

Justinian, however, refused to receive the *Constitutum*, on the ground that if it condemned the Three Chapters it was unnecessary, seeing that Vigilius in his *Judicatum* had already condemned them; whereas, on the other hand, if he now modified his former judgment, he condemned himself. The Emperor then sent directions to the council that the name of the Pope should be stricken from the dipytchs, which order was, of course, obeyed by the subservient Eastern episcopate. In their eighth session this assembly proceeded to carry out the remaining wish of the Emperor and anathematized the Three Chapters, "that is to say, the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia and his blasphemous books; also whatever of an impious character has been written by Theodoret and the blasphemous letter attributed to Ibas; we anathematize them as well as those who defend them, who regard the Three Chapters as orthodox, and who wish to cover their impiety with the authority of the holy fathers and of the Council of Chalcedon."

For seven months Vigilius declined to approve the acts of the Council of Constantinople, which time he spent in exile, in the island of Proconnessus. Then, suffering intensely as he did from a most painful disease, he yielded to the Emperor's will and gave the required approval. After further examination of the question, he finally wrote, and, following the example of St. Augustine, he had now made up his mind to acknowledge his mistakes. He therefore anathematized and condemned the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as what Theodoret of Cyr had written against the orthodox faith and St. Cyril and the impious letter attributed to Ibas of Edessa.

Vigilius survived this last act of weakness less than a year and died at Syracuse, on his return journey to Rome, June 7, 455. Of course, in reality there was no contradiction between the Council

of Chalcedon and the Council of Constantinople; whereas, the decision of the latter was identical with the *Constitutum*, save in the matter of the condemnation of *persons* as well as writings. The former council had said nothing at all about Theodore of Mopuestia, and in the view of their acceptance of the faith of Chalcedon, had refrained from expressing any disapproval of the polemical works of Theodoret and Ibas. But the Emperor, rejoicing in his discovery that the molehill ignored by six hundred Bishops was a veritable theological mountain, insisted, with all the obstinacy of a pedant, on condemning the so-called "Three Chapters." True, he expected great results from this condemnation, but such an expectation only proved how little he knew of the monophysites; the only result of his ill advised, tyrannical activity in this tedious controversy was to alienate the West without in the least conciliating the East. As for the Pope, in his stronger and better moments he had manfully resisted the efforts made by the Emperor to force him to perform acts which, no matter what might be said to the contrary, were a reflection on the Council of Chalcedon. For the position assumed by Justinian tacitly implied that the secular head of the empire was a better judge of what was expedient in this case than an assembly of the Bishops of Christendom. The fault of the second Council of Constantinople, as well as of Vigilius, in approving its decisions lay, primarily, in its indirect admission that such a view was justified. There was no question of contradictory pronouncements by two general councils, but merely a question as to whether it was better to ignore with Chalcedon or to take cognizance of and condemn, under imperial pressure, with Constantinople.

Thus once again did a Roman emperor succeed in imposing his will on the Eastern Church and at the same time in introducing confusion and schism in the West. How much longer would Christendom submit to the arbitrary interference in its internal concerns of these Eastern Cæsars? The history of the Church in the next century and a half was to answer this question very clearly and decisively.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Harrisburg, Pa.

THE PAPAL SWISS GUARDS.

THOIWALDSEN'S colossal statue of "The Dying Lion," which is hewn into the solid stone side of a mountain at Lucern, is a classic symbol and monument of the courage and loyalty of a mountaineer people who have had to struggle constantly with a nature which is nowhere else in the world surpassed in beauty and grandeur. The sublime Alpland seems to have been made by the Creator as the impregnable fortress and citadel of liberty in Europe. True it is that for hundreds of years this small people have been able to keep the pearl of liberty at its own high and unpurchasable price in the very face of grasping and bargaining neighbors. The familiarity with mountain pass and untrodden forest, the constant danger of a visit from an uninvited invader, the very hardship of existence have made this people the best and most valiant defenders of liberty. No country that ever sought to throw off the yoke of oppression or repel the encroachments of an enemy ever turned in vain to Switzerland for help. Because mere existence there is a schooling in hardship severer than any military life imparts, we find that every man is a born warrior or early turned into one. Though the Swiss army has always been insignificant and never worth counting as far as numbers are concerned, and though military service has never been required for more than three months in years of peace, yet we can scarcely name an army of Europe, during the late Middle Ages, which has not had a good sprinkling of these sturdy and experienced warriors.

If the Swiss are conservative—and it could not be otherwise with a people who live in the shadow of the eternal hills—they have also been tenacious of the faith. Indeed many did fall away from Rome to accept the stern rigorism of Calvin, which seems to come naturally to this people of sturdy, rugged and prosaic temper. But those who remained loyal and faithful to the See of Peter have given the most glorious example of devotion to the successor of the Fisherman King. Truth to tell, the Swiss are, perhaps, one of the most religious people of Europe. Not without reason did Dumas call them a "nation of sacristans." If it is true that few converts to Rome have ever been made in Switzerland since the Reformation, then, on the other hand, we must admit that few Catholics have ever been converted to the philosophy of life which can satisfy religious yearnings by aught else than the most whole-hearted devotion to the Church. There are few half-hearted, indifferent Catholics in Switzerland. Perhaps in no land do we find a more pious

body of men. The Swiss may have a narrow outlook upon the world. But they only look upward when seeking the Spouse of Christ. Hence they are Petrine to the core. And in all history there cannot be found a more consistent and persistent loyalty to the temporal claims of the Pope than that which they have shown. During four centuries the Papal Swiss Guards have tried to do for the Vicar of Christ what they have tried to do for every oppressed nation because they succeeded in doing it for themselves—to obtain and maintain liberty and freedom despite the greatest obstacles from within and without. No other nation has shed so much blood for Rome on the battlefield, none other has sacrificed itself so generously, unsparingly and gladly for the temporal prestige of the Holy See. The Swiss to a man desires liberty for himself with a passion that borders very near on fanaticism. And because he knows from experience the blessed utilities and advantages of freedom, he does not hesitate one moment in staking everything to obtain it for him who needs it most and has the strongest claims on it, the Pope of Rome, the Fisherman King of the Vatican Hill. The Swiss speaks little—perhaps a blessing and mercy for sensitive ears—but he does great things naturally and easily with an iron determination and eagle quickness.

To the eternal shame of our legion of Catholic historians it must be said that the surpassingly inspiring story of the Papal Swiss Guards has, so far, been almost left untold by them. If it is true that Dame History has, in these latter days, been baptized with the waters of Catholic science, then this neglect is nothing else than a culpable sin of omission or else the more heinous sin of criminal indifference. No doubt in every history of the Papacy which aims at anything like fullness the mention of Swiss warriors must frequently appear. But this passing mention is not sufficient. For the fair country hid away in the Alps did not send a few warriors at rare and intermittent intervals to assist the Popes in maintaining their temporal sovereignty and independence. During four centuries the little land, which sorely stood in need of every strong arm and stout heart of its own and could dispense with its own soldiers only at a great risk to its own safety and a greater danger of becoming involved in political quarrels with the enemies of the Pope, during four centuries and more Switzerland maintained a regularly organized and equipped body of soldiers at Rome. In times of peace as also of war they were at the Pope's disposition. It is this systematic and organized assistance given to the Holy Father by Catholic Switzerland which merits recognition at the hands of historians. "In times of war all men are soldiers," Tertullian somewhere says, "and every warrior who does his duty fully deserves

an honorable mention. Now most victorious generals sooner or later obtain a biography or else a paragraph in the story of the great battles of the world." But it is the soldier of the rank and file of the army, without whom no general could win his laurels, who should be remembered by the historian, who must be generous in his praise to all, if he is to be considered just and fair-minded. For generosity and valor no army ever surpassed the Papal Swiss Guards who have been volunteers from the beginning. The soberest historian will feel his soul swell with admiration when studying the history of this Papal army.

This history of the Swiss Guards of the Pope calls for a really superior savant. The Papal Guards must be separated from a miscellaneous army of men in the Pope's service for a mention apart, as being, *par excellence*, the Pope's regular troops. A man who cannot keep the Swiss Guards distinct from the occasional warriors on the side of the Pope; who cannot understand that, as the regular bodyguard of the Holy Father, they were the leaders who bore the brunt of the conflict and attack and shared the fate of the battle with the Father of Christendom, be it in flight, captivity or taxation; who cannot picture for himself the worry and anxiety amongst the soldiers who had to cast about on all sides for means to recruit their thinned ranks from a country which was always sparsely populated; a man who cannot understand and take into account these and a score of other like circumstances which make the history of the Papal Guards a history apart and by itself closely bound up with the temporal vicissitudes of the Holy See, a short-sighted man had better not undertake the long-deferred labor which bristles with difficulties of all sorts. But the very difficulties of the task ought to invite some historian of talent, patience and courage to tell a story which would prove so sweet and entrancing to many a Catholic ear that is still ringing with the tragedy of the loss of the Papal temporal power. Perhaps, too, the remembrance of the glorious achievements and still more glorious devotion of the Swiss Guards would give us courage to hope for and strive for the restoration of those States and that independence for which they gladly bled in nearly every corner of Italy during more than four hundred years.

The history of the Papal Swiss Guards as an organized and distinct part of the army of the Popes dates from the year 1505. The creation, organization and equipment of a standing army for the protection of the Pope's person and the defense of the Patrimony of St. Peter was the glorious achievement of that mighty, indomitable military genius, Julius II. When he succeeded Pius III. on the Pontifical throne on November 1, 1503, the internal and

external conditions of the Papal States were in a very sorry plight. For scores of years every rapacious ruler of the many petty States of Italy, whose ambitions were larger than his lands, had taken his turn at cutting off for himself appreciable parts of the Papal domains. The shortsighted political policies of several of Pope Julius' predecessors, especially Alexander VI., had almost dynamited the independence of the Holy See. Julius II., with that energy which Michael Angelo wrote upon every limb and muscle of his colossal "Moses," which is nothing else than an idealized statue of this Pope on whose tomb it was intended to figure, with that quickness, resolve and resourcefulness which would have made him the conquering leader of any handful of men, cast about on all sides for allies to continue a holy war—a crusade indeed, not in the distant Orient as of old, but on the very fields of sacred Italy—a war against the enemies of God because they were the enemies of Christ's Spouse, the Holy Church. Whilst still Cardinal Julius della Rovere, the Pope had had ample opportunity to see for himself the dauntless valor of the Swiss soldiers. As commendatory Bishop of Lausanne from 1472 to 1476 he had seen with his own eyes that these peasants went off to war as to a banquet. They were undoubtedly the best free lances of Europe. Besides, the Pope had had frequent intercourse with Peter de Herenstein, canon of Sion, Beromünster, Basel and Constance, who had carried through at Rome many delicate missions and charges of his fatherland, Herenstein had warrior's blood in his veins, being the son of the hero of Morat, Caspar de Herenstein. At the Diet of Zürich on September 5, 1505, he obtained permission to raise an army of two hundred men for the immediate defense of the Pope. Shortly afterwards Caspar de Silinen marched towards the Eternal City at the head of this troop of picked Swiss soldiers.

This first colonel captain—for the head of the Papal Guard, like the leader of the Swiss army, has never assumed the pompous title of general—was born in 1474. His father, Alban de Silinen, was one of the leading warriors at the battles of Morat, Verene and Netstal. With his father, Caspar had fought on the side of the French in the Neapolitan campaign. He was a man of great courage and enthusiasm—every inch a soldier. He sought to give play to his unbounded love for the Church and its head by the practice of arms—for he loved war as the very breath of his nostrils. At his word many of his countrymen rallied under the Papal banner, without, however, obtaining beforehand the permission of the heads of the cantons. This first Papal Swiss army fought bravely in the campaign which won back for the Pope in the year 1505 the fair and important cities of Perugia, Bologna, Ravenna, Faenza, Cervia,

Imola, Cesena and Rimini. Encouraged by these successes, the Pope now determined on recapturing the other leading Italian cities which Venice had snatched from Cæsar Borgia, to the great chagrin and danger of the Roman See. The better to realize the plan which he had not hesitated to divulge to the Venetian Ambassador, Pisani, the Pope entered the League of Cambrai on December 10, 1508. Thus the Pope of Rome joined hands with the kings of France, Austria and Spain and the dukes of Savoy, Ferrara, Mantua and Urbino against the common foe of Italian peace and security, the Venetians. Through his intermediary, Matthias Schinner, whom he had raised to the Sacred College of Cardinals in September of that same year, Julius II. made an appeal for troops to the entire Swiss Confederation. At Aguadello, on May 14, 1509, Venice was completely beaten and at one stroke lost all her precious possessions in the peninsula. The proud warriors of the Adriatic city desired earnestly to be reconciled with the Pope. For in those bloody days men might have the courage, when intoxicated with war, to brave the anger of the Father of Christendom. But no vanquished enemy was hardy enough to sulk at the forgiving Father's knee. Hence on February 24, 1510, five ambassadors from Venice, with Mocenigo at their head, knelt humbly on the steps of the Vatican basilica to beg the everlasting pardon of the Pope as he was carried by on his ebony chair. Julius II. was great in war, but he surpassed himself in peace and a spirit of dignified forgiving. Assisted by twelve Cardinals and surrounded with his faithful Swiss Guards, he ordered the Miserere to be chanted. At each verse of this cry for pardon he touched the shoulders of one of the ambassadors with a golden sceptre. Then the Venetians were conducted to their quarters amid the jubilant shouts of approval of the Roman people. It was a typically mediæval scene, perhaps the last of its kind in the history of the world, a scene when stern justice and sweet forgiveness were seen to have been meted out by the Father of all Christendom in a right kingly and picturesque manner.

The Pope now dreamed of clearing Italy of the French armies, which in his need he had been constrained to call upon for help against the Venetians. Cardinal Schinner, who was a diplomat of the finest type and enjoyed an immense popularity in his native land, where he occupied the See of Sion, entered into fresh negotiations with the Helvetian States. At Lucern he succeeded in closing a treaty with the cantons on February 26, 1510, which was to last five years. In August of the same year six thousand men passed in review before him at Martigny before setting out for Rome. But this army was forced to disband in the passes which lead over the Alps, because discord had broken out amongst its

leaders. The devotion of the private soldiers to the cause of the Holy Father remained strong and burning despite the pettiness of the leaders. For in October, 1511, at the instigation of Ulrich Hoenig, of Schwyz, ten thousand men, for the most part from the cantons of Bern, Fribourg and Soleure, banded themselves together in a new Papal army. At Lugano another eight thousand men from the remaining cantons of the Confederation joined them. But once more the leaders of the troops proved unfaithful. For they were bought over by the money of the French to promise, on the pretext of the bitterness of the winter season, not to proceed beyond the walls of Milan. Gaston de Foix assimilated and incorporated a great part of these disbanded troops into his own army, and on April 11, 1512, after having chastised Brescia for its unfaithfulness and supineness to his cause, won a brilliant victory over the Ravennese troops. But De Foix fell, mortally wounded, in this engagement, together with many more of the leaders of the army. Thus one of the most formidable armies which ever marched against the Eternal City was definitively removed from the field.

Nothing daunted by this repeated infidelity of the Swiss leaders, Julius II. again sent Cardinal Schinner to the Diet of the Helvetian Confederation to plead the formation of another army. On May 6, 1512, the cantons agreed to send help to the Pope. Twenty thousand soldiers met at Coire, crossed the Engaddine, where they were joined by a large contingent of troops from the Swiss Oberland; arrived at Trent, where the Bishop, George de Niedeck, received the leaders in a really princely fashion. Here the army encamped for some days, because the welcome everywhere manifested was unfeignedly genuine. Ulrich, of Hohensac, was chosen captain general of all the troops; James Stapfer, of Zürich, colonel of the infantry, and John de Lanthen-Heid, of Fribourg, commander of the artillery. At Verona Cardinal Schinner joined the troops. He assured them of the early arrival of the Papal and Venetian armies. From the hands of this Prince of the Church each soldier received his pay, whilst the head of the armies received a banner of red silk adorned with pearls in the shape of a dove representing the Holy Ghost, as also a precious sword encrusted with pearls. These were the gifts of the Pope to his fighting men. Panting for battle, the troops marched from Verona to Villafranca, where they were joined by ten thousand Venetians under the command of Paul Baglione. By way of Valeggio, Cremona and Pavia the army reached Milan, where on the last day of the year 1512 Maximilian Sforza received its leaders and representatives of each battalion in his own palace, and gave them for headquarters his own fortified castles at Lugano, Locarno, Valeggio and Mendrizio. The Swiss

troops remained in the environs for the forthcoming coronation ceremonies of the Duke of Milan.

Julius II. was delighted beyond words with the glorious victories which these troops everywhere reported. Every opposition being, as was every form of military defense in the Italy of that day, of a small though at times very troublesome nature, every obstacle to the victorious progress of this army of the Pope faded away like thin smoke before the onmarching cohorts. The Holy Father knew full well that the enthusiasm for his person, which reigned in this miscellaneous army that swept on victoriously through Italy, was engendered by the ardor of the Swiss soldiers, who to valor and daring unspeakable joined the most contagious and infectious loyalty to the Holy See. Enthusiasm was a better cement in such a varied mass of men than the most rigid military discipline. Hence in the fullness of his joy he ratified on July 3, 1512, the brief which had been drawn up on the twenty-second day of the preceding June, in which the title of "*Defensores libertatis Ecclesiæ*" had been conferred in perpetuity upon the Swiss. This is by far the most glorious title which has ever been given by the Pope to an entire people. Kings in the past had, no doubt, merited from the Pope honorific titles for one reason or another. But in this case the entire Confederation received a name of distinction from the Supreme Pontiff, a name which is as eloquent of the Pope's appreciation as it is of a people's devotion to the best and most legitimate cause. Even yet the Swiss Catholics glory in this title of four hundred years ago; and they have never forfeited their right to it by withdrawing their sympathy and support from the successors of him who gave it first to their forefathers. This title is still current in Papal diplomatics. Over and above this, the Pope gave the army two gorgeous banners embroidered with the cross and the Papal coat-of-arms. To each canton of the Confederation a banner in silk was sent, on which the figure of the local patron saint was stitched in gold. The Pope himself gathered his warriors about him in the Vatican basilica and offered up a Mass of thanksgiving to God for the victory of Ravenna. Raphael has immortalized this very memorable event in a sketch for a tapestry. Julius II., moreover, extended to the Diet of the Swiss Confederation an invitation to send ambassadors to the Eternal City to discuss with the Father of Christendom the political interests of the Church Universal. Caspar de Silinen, colonel captain of the Papal Guards, proceeded as far as Florence to meet the Deputies of the Diet. He carried with him gorgeous court dresses in silk and embroidery, lest the vivacious and carping courtiers of Rome hold up to innocent ridicule and jest these sturdy mountaineer people with their simple

Swiss dress. As soon as the party reached the walls of the Eternal City it was met by the Roman nobility, and, to the booming of cannon and the music of countless bands, was led through the streets of the city, which were groaning with a dense crowd of grateful people, who wept and cheered for their delight and welcome. The Holy Father himself begged to be carried to a spot whence he might see the pageant and bless the loyal-hearted representatives of the faithful cantons. Some days later the Pope, surrounded by his Cardinals, received them in a private conference. Lienhardt Grieb, of Basel, read a Latin address of thanks to the Pope in the name of the cantons who had sent him to represent them in the council of the First Man of Christendom. Never, perhaps, has a glorious warrior been more gloriously welcomed in the proud old city by the tawny Tiber. A few weeks later, Peter Falk, of Fribourg; John Erlach, of Bern, and James Stafileo moved on to Venice to arrange a permanent treaty of peace between the City of the Popes and the City of the Doges. The year 1512 was a golden one in the military annals of Switzerland—for Switzerland proved itself capable of helping to realize, in an eminent way, the grandiose schemes of a mighty man who sought liberty for the Spouse of Christ as the best means of giving free play to her passion for beneficent activity. Julius II. was fully aware, as he himself said more than once, that God had His own plans and designs with regard to the temporal mission and vicissitudes of His Church. What he, however, could never bring himself to see or allow was that the Papal States should be the target for every band of petty warriors. If the Church was to be enslaved it must be done by none other than a race of Napoleons. But men of Napoleonic courage and daring came from the distant mountain country of the Alps and ranged themselves on the side of the Pope. And hence the giant Della Rovere Pope was right in bestowing on these a name which they well deserved and merited. Julius, however, was not to enjoy long the independence which he had vindicated for the Papal kingdom. On February 21, 1513, he passed away, and, on his own wish, was buried in the humble Church of San Pietro, in Vincoli, where he had so often repaired during his Papal career, to pray with uplifted hands, like Moses, for victory on his arms. His reign will ever be memorable in so far as it marks a period of victory and upward motion in all departments of the Church's life. He scotched the serpent of schism when he did away with the canonically irregular convention of Pisa; he drove the gloating and painted barbarians beyond the Alps; the omnipresent money-lenders and usurers who held more than one damning bond against the Papal exchequer, he sent off contentedly, with

bursting purses and money bags, without, however, having done any damage to the financial status of his throne; he dealt out well-merited punishments on the enemies of peace and order who were the enemies of his Holy See, and best of all, he won back liberty, independence and prestige for the Church at the cost of much sweat and labor and prayer. These and other temporal blessings for the Church were to become the mere baubles which that extravagant patron of verse-makers and word-brokers, the second Medicean Pope, Leo X., squandered right and left without thought during his reign over the Fisherman's kingdom.

Leo X. on ascending the Papal throne on March 13, 1513, did not dispense with the services of the Swiss Guards, which numbered two hundred, under the command of Caspar Silinen. One of his first acts in their regard was to arm them with lances, which, though picturesque and ornamental, were not by any means so serviceable in actual conflict as the swords they had so far made use of. Leo X. also commanded Michael Angelo to design a uniform for his guards. This consisted of a doublet and short breeches in red, yellow and green, with a black velvet cap, adorned with a white plume for officers and colored plumes for the soldiers. Later on details of this uniform were changed to satisfy the tastes of subsequent ages. But in its general design and colors it has remained the same until our day. The pay of the soldiers was fixed at four gold crowns per month. A uniform and small accessories were given to each soldier annually.

The political policies of the Pope were greatly furthered by the victory over the French at Novarro on June 6, 1513, in which the Swiss played a noble and preponderating part. In the year 1514 Leo X. entered into a treaty with the Confederation by the stipulations of which he was authorized to raise troops in all the cantons in times of war. The Pope, on his part, agreed to pay annually to each canton the sum of two thousand gold florins. Francis I., who had meanwhile succeeded to the throne, inherited all the boundless ambitions of his predecessor, Louis XII. He at once began to gather an army of thirty-five thousand men, with whom he hoped to regain the Duchy of Milan, which Julius II. had placed in the hands of his liegeman, the Sforza. On September 4, 1515, the Swiss were sorely beaten at Marignano after a sharp encounter which had lasted two days. In haste they fled for shelter and protection to Milan, carrying their cannons on their shoulders and their wounded comrades in the centre of their decimated ranks. Though the pride of the French battalions was much wounded by the great losses which they had sustained at the hands of an army which was two-thirds smaller than their own in numbers,

Francis I., with a show of power which was little less than burlesque, had himself proclaimed "chevalier" by Bayard, the "chevalier sans peur et sans reproche." The Swiss were constrained against their will to come to terms with the victors, and with the best grace which they could muster entered into a treaty of perpetual friendship with the French. The Pope, eleven days later, on December 10, 1516, made a concordat with Francis whereby he was able to keep for himself the ecclesiastical revenues and annates which he always stood in need of to satisfy the rapacity of the hordes of worldly-minded literati who now moved about freely in the Vatican palaces. The Pope, on his part, relinquished his claims to Parma and Piacenza in favor of the French king, to whom he also granted the right of episcopal and abbatial nominations in France. The Swiss were deeply scandalized at the extravagance of the Pope in favor of the literati at a time when every soldo was needed for purposes of war, and the recent defeat had greatly cooled their enthusiasm for a Pope who had not only taken the disgrace of Marignano lightly and cool-bloodedly, but immediately began to pursue a course of political flirtations with untried and unknown allies. And just at the same hour the Reformers began to preach strange doctrines throughout the North, which were either not understood or else not heeded at Rome. Discontent was rife. And the Pope, like a true Medici, only sought to quell the murmurs of the hour by fair words which no one believed or trusted, or by granting privileges to certain classes which did an infinite hurt to the feelings of long tried friends. Thus the agent of the Canton of Zürich at Rome did not hesitate to remind the Pope that he was sadly in arrears with his pay for the soldiers and his annual grant to the canton. Nearly all the Swiss cantons took it ill when Lucern was given the exclusive right to choose the captain colonel of the Papal troops without so much as having heard the wish of the other districts. At the Diet of Baden in June, 1517, it was admitted and proclaimed on all sides that the Pope had annulled his agreement with the cantons. But all dissatisfaction came visibly to the surface, like a rash, when Leo X., true nepotist that he was, handed over the Duchy of Urbino to his nephew, Lorenzo de Medici, after having deposed Francesco della Rovere, nephew of Julius II., for felony and the murder of a Cardinal. Hence when Caspar de Silinen sought permission from the cantonal authorities to raise an army of three thousand Swiss soldiers to repel the advance march of Della Rovere, he met with little success and less enthusiasm. Despite the positive prohibitions of the head of the cantons, Caspar succeeded in gathering together a troop of about two thousand volunteers. With these he marched against Della Rovere, whose

troops had been augmented in the meantime by the troops of Spain. At Rimini, whilst they were in camp expecting no attack, the Pontifical troops, of which the Swiss formed the head, were surrounded by eight thousand Spaniards. A veritable massacre went on. The Swiss fought bravely, like tigers, but finally succumbed to the greater numbers of the adversary. Caspar de Silinen fell, and with him fell one of the bravest warriors and staunchest friends of the Holy See. He was buried at Silinen on August 26, 1517, with all the honors of war. The Dominican John Faber pronounced the funeral oration, which was later on edited, for the third time, by Oswald Myconius. From this interesting eulogy and panegyric, which contains many bits of personal information about the illustrious dead warrior, we can learn the deep piety and boundless charity to the poor of this first leader of the Papal Swiss Guards, as also the great qualities of mind and heart which the rough schooling of the camp and battlefield only brought to the light more prominently. He was indeed an ideal Christian warrior—a Crusader of the Pope—truth to tell, a Papal Tancred, without a Tancred's Gallic madness and shortsightedness.

The post of captain colonel was provisionally filled by Silinen's brother, Christopher. Bartholomew Berwaeger, of Appenzell, desired ardently to receive the appointment to this post and tried many means to obtain it. This goes far to show that it was a charge of distinction. But the Pope saw the pressing need of conciliating to himself the Canton of Zürich and of binding it by every possible band to the Holy See, because the new doctrines were making rapid progress there amongst the people. Hence the Bishop of Veroli and Apostolic Delegate to Switzerland, Ennodius Philonardus, offered the command of the army to the Mayor of Zürich, Marc Roüist, who accepted it, after much hesitation, with the consent of the cantonal authorities. In his chagrin and disappointment Berwaeger embraced the new doctrines in 1522. Owing to his advanced age, Roüist handed over the active command of the Papal Guards to his son Caspar.

Peace seemed to have descended at last upon Italy. Leo X., however, made use of this short breathing space to try to realize his dreams of finally putting down another enemy of the temporal power of the Holy See, Alphonsus d'Este. The Pope still looked for help to Switzerland. Hence Pucci, Bishop of Pistoia, hastened thither in the hope of gathering an army of six thousand men. Captain Göldi and Louis Erlach, who were at the head of the two divisions of the army, obtained free passage through Lombardy from the French king, who was leaving nothing undone to come to the terms of a treaty with the Swiss. The leaders of the Swiss

army were invited by the Pope to come for a brief consultation. The Pope received them with unfeigned affection, whilst the Roman people welcomed them with joy. Gifts of great value were heaped upon them and the soldiers. The Pope communicated to them his earnest desire of subduing and keeping in subjection the restless and dangerous Duke of Ferrara, which these faithful soldiers set about doing at once by taking from him the strongly garrisoned fortresses of San Felice and Finale. Marching out from their camp near Ancona the Swiss troops next hoped to capture Faenza. But the populace cast its lot with the Duke, and after a slight skirmish in the large piazza before the Duomo, the Swiss were allowed to withdraw freely, after having promised the podestà to abstain from further attempts at seizing the town.

In the meantime Maximilian had died, and three candidates presented themselves for the imperial crown. These were Henry VIII. of England, Francis I. of France and Charles V. of Austria, King of Spain, to whom the Swiss were favorably disposed. France succeeded in winning the support of twelve of the Swiss cantons and their allies for all measures save that of its imperial aspirations to the German crown. Now, the French, after a light encounter at Faenza, made an assault on Reggio, which was occupied by Italian troops. Leo X. took occasion of this to ally himself with Charles V., and was thereby forced to attempt to drive the French out of Italy, where these were continually extending their power and possessions. The Bishop of Veroli at once hastened to the Diet of Lucern, which was sitting, to ask for an army of ten thousand men. This demand was put off for later consideration by the Swiss, who were still mindful of their treaty with France. Zürich, which had refused to join the French treaty of May 17, 1521, raised an army of two thousand men, under the command of George Bergner. Seven hundred nondescript warriors from other cantons joined this army later on as the picked bodyguard of Cardinal Schinner, who had meanwhile joined the troops in order the better to rouse their enthusiasm for the Pope's cause. Another body of volunteers from the whole of Switzerland, numbering in all about six thousand men, rallied to the side of the Pope. Thus the Papal army of Swiss soldiers numbered about twenty thousand men, under the command of Prospero Colonna. He, with a small detachment of soldiers, besieged Reggio, whilst the remaining troops encamped near Medolè, whence Parma and Piacenza could always be kept in eye. Bergner avoided an open conflict with the French; but when these latter left Milan he hastened on towards Parma. But when, on December 1, 1515, Leo X. died, the Swiss troops begged for permission to return to their homes, since, they urged, with the death of the Pope,

their oath of allegiance to the cause of the Holy See was irretrievably broken. Thus ended the military relations of the Holy See with the ensemble of Swiss cantons. The Reformation, which was spreading rapidly throughout Switzerland, was, by its very nature, inclined to render the intercourse of these two old friends ever more and more strained.

Leo X. was succeeded on the Pontifical throne by Florence, of Utrecht, a former tutor of Charles V., who as the rigid and reforming Adrian VI. had little occasion, in his short reign, to show special marks of his confidence in the Swiss Guards. His Medicean successor, Clement VII., had much to thank the Swiss Guard for. For Italy had become again the common battlefield of Europe. The Swiss defended the interests of the Pope bravely at Bicoque, Sesia and Pavia, which were nothing else than last pangs of a military campaign inaugurated by Leo X. In order to draw back peace to the distracted country, the Pope, who as a Medici bore an innate antipathy to the French, was willing to open negotiations for an armistice. He professed himself willing to grant the Duchy of Milan to the son of Francis I., although this latter was a captive. The French king, on regaining his freedom, entered willingly, with Venice, Milan and Tuscany, into a league which the Pope had planned and carried through successfully at Cognac on May 22, 1526. The Swiss Confederation also joined the league, and James Tragen, of Ury, raised an army of eight thousand men, which was placed under the command of Claude of Savoy, Count of Tende. The leading Swiss lieutenants were Anthony Erlach, James de May, William Hirenstein and Francis Armbruster. Half of the troops marched upon Milan by way of Lugano, without having so much as espied a foe on the way. The other half of the army set out directly for Rome. Intercepted on the way by Anthony de Leyva and Caspar Frondenberg, the Swiss lost more than eight hundred men.

In June of the year 1526 Charles de Bourbon threw his ragged and impoverished armies upon Lombardy in the hope of obtaining by pillage and plunder the pay of his soldiers, which was greatly in arrears. Milan, after a slight resistance, had to submit to the most systematic kind of pillage at the hands of these starving soldiers. The safety of Rome was threatened, and in fear Clement VII. closed a treaty with Launoy, Vice-King of Naples. On the advice of Moncade, Ambassador of Spain, he promised to pay eight thousand ducats to the King if he would promise to withdraw his troops from the Papal domains. But just on account of the insufficient fortification of Rome, Prospero Colonna, who had in the meantime turned against the Pope, swooped down with eight thou-

sand peasants on the Transtevere quarters of the city. The Pope, who had none of his Swiss Guards at hand, was driven to take refuge in the Castle of San Angelo. During an entire year the sack of Lombardy by Charles V. went on with unrelenting persistence and cruelty. And when the Protestant peasants of the Tyrol heard of the ample booty that was to be had easily in Italy they rallied in great numbers under the banner of George Fronden-berg, a savage man, who marched at the head of his troops wearing a gold chain about his neck with which he would strangle the Pope, he boasted. Charles V. and Leyva joined their troops to this horde of infuriated rabble. The social offal of Italy naturally associated itself with this mass of ruffians. This army of men, if the name of army is not too dignified a title for all that was worst in European society, marched by way of Ferrara and Bologna towards Rome, having given up the original route through Tuscany in order the earlier to seize their victim, who was none other than the Father of Christendom himself. The Duke of Urbino swelled the onmarching horde in order thus to revenge himself upon the Medici who had deprived him of his duchy. On May 5, 1527, Bourbon, with his newly worn allies, appeared before the walls of the Eternal City. The number of these banditti was put down by a contemporary writer at forty thousand. Frondenberg never saw Rome, for he had died on the way from a stroke of apoplexy, brought on, so it was said, by a life of drunkenness and debauchery. On the eve of the 6th of May the first assault was made upon the walls of the city. Bourbon was shot whilst leading an assault upon the gate of Santo Spirito. Knowing that his end was come, he begged his adjutant to cover up his body with his mantle, lest the soldiers, seeing his fate, might give up the fight and let slip their golden opportunity of revenge and pillage. Philibert, last of the princes of Orange of the house of Chalons, took the command, and in the bloodiest of the fray showed the soldiers the dead body of their leader, inciting them thus to merciless revenge. The soldiers succeeded in breaking through the city walls about 2 o'clock in the morning and marched directly upon the recently completed basilica of St. Peter. Here they were met by a handful of Swiss soldiers, two hundred and fifty all told, who fought with indomitable courage until nearly every one of their number had fallen. Amongst the slain was Roüst, the captain colonel of the Papal Guards. Eight hundred of the enemy were mowed down beside the entrenchments which had been hastily thrown up around the Vatican precincts. The Pope had time to retreat, by means of a secret passage, to the Castle of San Angelo with the forty soldiers who had survived the assault. With an unspeakable bloodthirstiness the invaders put

more than seven thousand Romans to death in less than twenty-four hours. Then they began to pillage the Eternal City in a right savage manner. The sacred vessels of the sanctuary were carried from the churches; altars were turned into banquet tables, around which a drunken soldiery, vested in the vestments of the Most High, danced in wildest frenzy. The soldiers then convened a mock conclave, declared the Pope deposed and elected in his place one of their number, whom they called by the very significant name of Pope Luther. This better than anything gives the clue to the whole spirit and temper of the invasion. The sack of the city by Alaric, or any other chief of his kind, was not more cruel, profane and sacrilegious than this one by a horde of men, most of whom had been baptized into the Church in their infancy. Clement VII. capitulated on June 5 with thirteen of his Cardinals and agreed to remain in prison until a sum of forty thousand ducats had been paid. He ceded Parma, Piacenza and Modena to the Germans, Ravenna to Venice and the Duchies of Urbino and Ferrara to the dukes who bore the names. Hardly had this horde of men disappeared from the city when an invasion of the French was threatened. But this calamity was averted by the Pope, who entered into a treaty with the Spaniards, who soon drove out of Italy the bandits of Froudsberg by means of an army under the command of Napoleon Orsini. The Pope entered into his own States with the assurance of permanent peace, as a result of the treaty of Barcelona (June 29, 1529), whereby Charles V. won the crown of Naples and the royal consecration as King of Italy.

The Swiss Papal Guards who survived these fatal months were so few in number and the services which they were enabled to render the Holy See were so insignificant that scarcely any official news of their good offices and vicissitudes, save perhaps the record of the death of the more prominent amongst them, has come down to us. But Clement VII. had seen for himself the loyalty of this people, and hence he strained every nerve to continue in friendly relations with the cantons. He was willing not to insist too much on religious differences so long as Switzerland would continue to furnish the soldiers of whom he stood much in need. On May 7, 1531, he tried to placate the cantonal authorities of Zürich, where the Reformation had taken a strong hold on the people, by reimbursing their treasury for the pensions which had been appropriated by an untrustworthy agent. Only with his death on September 15, 1534, did Clement VII. break with the Swiss.

As soon as Alexander Farnese had taken possession of the Papal throne on October 13, 1534, as Paul III., he turned his eyes affectionately upon the Swiss. He took it as a good omen to find soldiers

of the Protestant cantons of Zürich and Bern in the ranks of the Papal army, and through their mediation he tried, by every means and as many as he could, to maintain the friendly relations of the long gone Catholic past. Thus, with a daring at which we now can only wonder, he called upon the entire Swiss country for soldiers to conduct a crusade against the Turks, who were beginning, with fresh courage, to creep up over the fair provinces of Europe. Again, when he summoned the Council of Trent, the Pope invited the cantons to join in the work by assuring the meetings of the assembled fathers military protection and safety. His letters to the authorities were couched in terms of such paternal persuasiveness and trust that the Protestant leaders found it right hard to turn a deaf ear to his appeals and invitations. Only after he had learned that the Protestant cantons were hopelessly hostile to the Holy See for doctrinal reasons did he turn himself, in especially intimate condescension, to the Canton of Lucern, which had already shown itself the stronghold of Catholicism in the Confederation. The devotion to the See of Peter of all the men of the canton and the energy and valor of its magistrates won for them from the Pope a renewed confirmation of the title "Defenders of Papal Liberty." In a Brief of December 20, 1542, Paul III. praised them for their loyalty and devotion, and in an unintentional confidence he remarked that these warriors enjoyed his entire trust. He proved this in a very tangible manner by reorganizing the status of the Papal Swiss Guards. The recent wars, with their deplorable results to the prestige and finances of the Holy See, required an entirely new ordering of the Papal army. A detachment of 250 Swiss warriors, commanded by a colonel and a lieutenant, was reserved for the protection of the Pope's person. Though the Papal exchequer was in sore straits, the Pope pensioned munificently all the veterans of the recent wars whose services were no longer needed. This new corps of Papal Guards had its own court and enjoyed all the privileges, emoluments and exemptions of the company of one hundred Swiss lancers in the employ of France. Each soldier received the monthly pay of four gold crowns and two uniforms per year. In times of war or actual attendance upon the Holy Father the daily wages were increased. The Pope assigned them a barracks close to St. Peter's, near to the Porta Torroni, and supplied arms, ammunition, fire, light and rations. Discharge from service must be preceded by a notice three months in advance, and the expenses of each man's home journey to Switzerland were defrayed by the Pope. The rate of pensions for veterans was not altered. The salary of the captain was six hundred crowns per year. The original uniform was retained. The flag of the regiment

was the Papal standard, with an additional cross and keys in gold embroidered on either side. Jost von Maggen, a native of Lucern, of whom mention will be made later, was appointed colonel captain of the reorganized Guards. Caspar Silinen, son of the hero of Rimini, and generally known as Caspar II., was chosen captain; Jost Segesser de Baldegg was appointed lieutenant. An appeal was made to the Canton of Zürich to assist in recruiting the necessary number of soldiers. But the Protestants of the canton refused with courtesy, even regret, if we interpret aright their letter of February 9, 1548, published by Lutolf. In the month of March, 1548, a small troop, mostly composed of men from the Canton of Lucern, set out for Rome, headed by a banner which the brave Hans Hammerer bore aloft nearly all the way.

As the bodily safety of the Papal Legates at Bologna and Ravenna was, in those days of war and riot, constantly in danger, the Pope determined to create a guard for them after the model of that of Rome. Hence the Catholic cantons of Switzerland acceded to the Pope's desire and sent two detachments of soldiers of one hundred and fifty men each to protect the Papal representatives in the north of Italy. Later on the number of soldiers was reduced to fifty, under the command of a lieutenant. Peregrin Beroldingen was appointed the first lieutenant of the Bolognese Guards by a Brief of Julius III. on December 22, 1552. Four years later he resigned his post in order to join the forces of Henry II. The command passed into the hands of the baronial family of Arnoldi, of Spiringen, in which it ever remained till 1740. The family of Bessler de Wattingen held the command from 1740 till the French invasion of the Papal States. The Ravennese Guards were recruited solely from the Canton of Schwyz, though the captains were always chosen from the Tanner family, who resided in Ury. The era of partition and subdivision of the Papal Guards did not end with the sixteenth century. Early in the seventeenth century a corps of fifty Swiss soldiers was constituted for the protection of Ancona. Unterwalden at first furnished the men, but from the year 1660 the Canton of Ury attended to the recruiting of the small regiment. Clement IX., in 1668, created another small guard of fifty men for the protection of the Papal Legate at Ferrara. These men were drawn from the Canton of Zoug, and were commanded by members of the Brandenburg family up to the hour of the dissolution of the corps during the French invasion.

This dividing of the numerical strength of the Papal Guards—dictated as it was, in the first instance, by financial reasons—tended to dissipate the enthusiasm of the Swiss volunteers of the Church. But brave warriors and towering military geniuses were to be found

at all times in all or some of the small bodies of Papal soldiers. Chief amongst these was Jost von Meggen, the first captain colonel of the Roman division of the Papal Swiss Guards. He was the son of Werner von Meggen, an old and tried warrior who had fought against the Suabians and later on won distinction in the campaigns of Cappel. The youth received a very thorough education, and with his friend, Gily Tschudi, was one of the favorite pupils of the famous master Gladeanus. In 1525 he undertook an extended tour of Italy and France, adding a very complete knowledge of the languages of those countries to the tongues he had already mastered—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Portuguese and several of the Slav languages. On his return he married Appollonia von Hutter, from which union no issue sprang. He was elected member of the National Council on Christmas Day, 1530, and during ten years (1537-1547) administered the affairs of Weggis, Baden, Beromünster and Willison. In 1542 he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and on September 3 was created Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. Visiting Syria, Egypt, Turkey and Sicily on his return journey, he arrived at Rome on April 8, 1543, where he left a manuscript account of his travels, which was published after his death at Dillingen in 1580. The affairs of the Diocese of Constance called him to Rome in 1546. Julius III. recognized in him a profound politician and an able diplomat, and in his capacity as colonel captain of the Papal Guards, Von Meggen played a large part in the religious and political relations of the Holy See with Switzerland. His fatherland entrusted him with the delicate post of Agent to the Holy See, and the archives of Lucern contain many records of his activity. He took an active part in the preparatory labors of the Council of Trent. These countless labors did not hinder him from carrying out the details of the reorganization of the Papal Guards. His first endeavor was to carefully sort out the men whose duty it was to guard the person of the Pope. His ideals were lofty, and the requirements he looked for in a Papal soldier were deep piety, courage, valor and an unblemished life. Whosoever was found wanting in any of these points was forthwith dismissed from service. It is no wonder, therefore, that after a few months' command of the Guards, Von Meggen was pleased to hear from the lips of the Pope that these soldiers were the admiration and boast of the entire Pontifical court. Hence in 1556 the sturdy colonel received from the Pope honorary citizenship of the city of Rome. When Von Meggen's faithful support, the Ensign Ulrich Hankratt, died on October 15, 1549, his place was filled by Philip Russen, who soon won the affection of all men by his good conduct and distinction of manners. He rendered silent

but valuable services to the head of the Guards at a very critical time.

For Cardinal Caraffa in ascending the Pontifical throne as Paul IV. on May 23, 1555, did not on that account put aside his deep antipathy for the French. This brought about a passing misunderstanding between himself and his colonel captain, whose sympathies were all that way. This was tantamount to saying that Von Meggen bore no great friendship for the Pope's favorites—the Spaniards and Austrians. For the same reason he could not rouse himself to great enthusiasm for the Colonna whom the Pope favored, because they had set themselves against the growing influence of the French in the peninsula. The Guise and Caraffa partisans had sworn to oust the French at all odds from Italy. Antonio Caraffa was named commander of the Swiss soldiers in 1555, and a year later was made Marquis of Montebello. About the same time the Pope instituted a noble guard composed of 100 Roman patricians, whose duty it was to accompany the Pope as a mounted guard whenever he rode forth from the city. The Pope also tried to draw closer together the warring cities of Ferrara and Venice, hoping thus to win them to his side. In secret he began preparations for war against the Spaniards, which when they heard, they forthwith made an alliance with Henry II. There was nothing for the Pope to do, according to the military ethics of the day, than to labor at the dissolution of this armistice by playing off one against the other and to win the assurance of support of the Swiss. He set about at once doing this. Deputations from the cantons were invited to Rome to felicitate the Pope on his recent elevation to the Fisherman's throne. The Catholic cantons of Fribourg, Soleure and Appenzell acceded with pleasure to the Pope's invitation. Fleckenstein, of Lucern; Beroldingen, of Ury; Schorno, of Schwyz; Schönbrunner, of Zoug, and Lussy, of Unterwalden, were chosen as the representatives of Catholic Switzerland for the occasion. At Milan they were joined by the Deputies of the Grison League, John de Florin and Captain A'Marca. Their journey to the heart-city of Christendom resembled a triumphal procession. For the Pope had given orders and money to the keepers of hostleries along the route to treat these ambassadors in kingly fashion. Von Meggen was dispatched to Bologna to escort them to Rome. Thirty Cardinals came out of the city gates to receive them, supported by the Roman nobility and one thousand mounted soldiers. All the bells of the city rang in joyous welcome; two hundred cannon boomed from the Castle of San Angelo. Campanas, a professional orator of Rome, presented them to the Holy Father in a speech containing these words: "It is their ardent desire to share the good or evil fortune

of the Roman Church." John Francesco answered briefly in the name of the Pope: "Pious and brave nation, you merit more than the name of defenders of the faith; you are the advance guard of the Church. Beloved sons, receive the kiss of eternal peace and the assurance of our support." These ambassadors remained in Rome for seven months, which were months of uninterrupted feasting and rejoicing for them. All were created Roman knights, and finally departed laden down with gifts of gold. But on reaching their native land the ambassadors were surprised to learn that the Pope had addressed himself to their country for an army of soldiers to undertake a campaign against Philip II. of Spain. The Papal Legate Ruerta, accompanied by Caspar Silinen, of the Ravennese division of the Papal Guards, had begged Tschudi to submit the Pope's request to the Diet of Baden, which was to convene on February 11, 1557. Tschudi consulted a pious warrior, turned hermit, Scheuber by name, as to the course of action which he should adopt. The hermit dissuaded him from the step, and the Diet subsequently refused the demand. Melchior Lussy, despite the earnest warning of Scheuber, gathered a troop of three hundred men and arrived at Rome in July, 1557. The city was in the hands of the god of war. The Swiss Guard kept close to the Pope in order to save him from the hands of the Colonna, who were ravaging the Campagna, which stretches on all sides around the Eternal City. The Pontifical army directed its chief blows at the fortress of Paliano, which lay on the frontier of the Papal States, because the mother, wife and sisters of Marc Anthony Colonna had taken refuge there. On July 26, 1557, nearly four thousand Papal soldiers, under the command of Antonio Caraffa, were driven back to Segni by the Austrians. Later on an attack was made upon the Pope's soldiers by the Spaniards. Three-fourths of the Papal army was annihilated; five Papal banners were carried off as trophies; the surviving soldiers were led off to captivity, from which they were released in consideration of great sums of money. Thus Tanner had to pay three hundred crowns, Caspar Silinen and Schönbrunner one hundred and twenty crowns each. Lussy escaped to Rome, which he entered, says the chronicler, "full of thoughts of Scheuber's warning." And the pious hermit died at the same hour, exclaiming: "Behold a sad hour for our countrymen at Rome!" This victory of the Spaniards at St. Quentin ended the war definitely, and the Swiss warriors who still remained betook themselves to their homes. The whole campaign is pathetic to look upon, for it shows forth clearly how little earthly princes are to be depended upon! On September 8 of that same year Cardinals Caraffa, Santa Fiore and Viteletto, accompanied by Jost von Meggen, journeyed to

Palestrina to conclude peace with the Duke of Alba. On the thirteenth day of the same month Von Meggen thanked his Swiss comrades for their services in the war and gave each man three crowns to accomplish the return journey to Switzerland. On the 19th of the month peace was made with Philip II. by Cardinal Caraffa and with the King of France by Cardinal Trivulcio. Jost von Meggen died shortly afterwards at Lucern, where he had been called to settle family business. Caspar Silinen III., captain of the Ravennese division of the Papal Guards, was chosen on March 17, 1559, as his successor. Just five months and one day later the new colonel captain had to give orders to his men to keep the night vigils by the bier of the Pope. On Christmas Day of the same year Rome was in rejoicing at the coronation of Cardinal Medici as Pope Pius IV. He set about at once to reform abuses in the Church and to introduce a greater simplicity at the Papal court. Lussy was delegated by the Catholic cantons to felicitate the Pope, in their name, on his election. At the same time he begged the Holy Father to take pity on Switzerland by appointing a protector in the person of the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, St. Charles Borromeo. This appointment resulted in much good for the Church in the Helvetic lands. The Papal Guards under the new regime introduced by the Pope found little occasion to render more than ornamental service. We find few notices of the Swiss Guards during this time. In April, 1561, the personnel of the army was as follows:

Colonel captain, Caspar Silinen III.; lieutenant, Hans Schinner, of Valais; ensign, Jost de Mettenwyl; judge, James Bazenhofer, of Lucern; sergeants, William Thilman and Bernard Kopp.

On September 20, 1564, the list of officers was as follows:

Colonel captain, Caspar Silinen III.; lieutenant, James Marquart, of Sargans; ensign, Bernard Kopp; judge, William Henneberg, of Lucern; secretary, James Eberli.

The fact that on the death of Caspar Silinen III. on July 16, 1564—who was the last of his race—several candidates for the post of colonel captain came forward goes far to prove that it was looked upon as one worth having. The chief candidates were James Marquart, William Thilman and Gabriel Serbelloni, who was the son of the general of the Pontifical troops. Intrigues were even rife amongst the soldiers, who had split themselves up into cliques the better thus to promote the claims of their respective candidates. Lucern, which had long since proved itself the stronghold of Catholicism in Switzerland, insisted strongly on its inalienable right to propose a candidate for the post chosen from amongst the volunteers of the canton. The Pope, in the past, had recognized

this claim in words if not always in deed. The Lucern contingent of soldiers, which was by far the greatest of any canton, also urged that this right of presenting a candidate had been a condition laid down in the promise made to the Pope of opening a recruiting office on their soil at the time of the Council of Trent. The cantons of Ury, Schwyz, Zoug and Unterwalden supported the claims of Lucern. When the Pope saw that Lucern was in real earnest and did not mean on any account to relinquish its pretensions, he authorized the cantonal Grand Council to appoint a commander of the Papal Guards. The choice fell upon Jost von Segesser, Lord of Baldegg and a close relative of Jost von Meggen. On March 4, 1566, the new colonel captain was presented to the Pope and the Roman gonfaloniere, Hannibal de Hohenems, who both received him with great courtesy. Marquart and Thilman, in chagrin and disappointment, asked for their discharge, and Hans Hammerer, who had been one of the leaders of discontent, was expelled for bad conduct.

During a long period of twenty-seven years Von Segesser served the Holy See in many positions of trust. He held his commission as colonel captain of the Papal Swiss Guards during the Pontificates of Paul IV., Pius V., Gregory XIII., Sixtus V. and Urban VII. This is by far the best proof of his worth and efficiency. He displayed an even more embracing activity than did his uncle, Von Meggen, before him. In 1571 he rendered such conspicuous assistance to Walter de Roel, the Ambassador of five Swiss cantons to the Holy See, that he received a public and official letter of thanks from the authorities on May 22, 1572. In this letter he was also asked to present Lussy to the Pope. The Swiss captain had been sent to Rome to extend the expression of satisfaction of the cantons to the Holy Father for Segesser's valuable help. His voluminous correspondence, which is still preserved in the archives of Lucern, shows that he took a large part in various Papal negotiations of a political kind with Spain, Poland, Moravia, Florence, Venice, Portugal, France and the Orient. He was the soul of all reforms in Switzerland. To name but a few, we find him engaged in promulgating and having enforced the decrees of the Tridentine Council, in fostering the disciplinary reform of the clergy, in the foundation of institutes of higher education, in the calling of the Jesuits to Lucern and the Capuchins to several cantons, in the founding of a seminary in the Italian district of the Confederation, in collecting money for burses for Swiss students in the seminary of Milan, in the creation of a vicariate apostolic at Constance for the five Catholic cantons, in the erection of a Papal Nunciature in Switzerland in 1579, in bringing about the formation

of the Golden League, or the Borromeo League as it is called, in 1587. Besides these negotiations which made for a *modus vivendi* of the Church in a land that had grown inimical, in large part, to the Holy See, we find him busily engaged in purely state matters at Geneva, Neuchâtel and Valtelline. These duties often necessitated his absence from Rome. Lussy, by alleging this as a pretext, tried to have himself installed as colonel captain of the Papal Guards. But Von Segesser was too highly valued by the Pope to be dispensed with. He died, worn out by labors for Church and fatherland, at Florence on July 8, 1592, and his burial was magnificent. With Von Segesser disappeared one of the most loyal and tireless workers of the cause of the Holy See. His name is still held in benediction—and this causes us to wonder all the more that no worthy and complete biography of the man has been written.

Segesser was beside himself with joy when the news went forth that Cardinal Alexandria was chosen as successor to Paul IV. The newly elected took the name of Pius V. The choice was especially agreeable to the Swiss, for whilst still an humble friar preacher the Pope had shown great interest in Switzerland at Como, where he was Inquisitor. No one dreamed that this quiet, unassuming and peace-loving man was destined to win an imperishable name as a Papal warrior—second only to Julius II. But in 1570 Selim II., who had come to the throne of the Sultans through blood, snatched the island of Cyprus from the Venetians. It was a bold step and one that boded no good for Christendom. For the spot had a strategic importance for the Turks which no one could gainsay. Selim was now in close and dangerous proximity to the European mainland—and he dreamed of bringing it under the rule of the leathern apron. Pius V. saw the danger at once and called upon the Christian world to drive back the Mussulman, who was stealing upon Europe like a bloodthirsty beast. The Pope brought about a coalition of the Christian soldiers of the Papal States, Spain, Malta, Venice and the several minor republics of Italy against the countless warriors of the East. Germany, France, England and Poland refused to join in the crusade. Segesser was sent to Switzerland, and especially to Lucern and Valais, to gather an army of soldiers for the proposed campaign. He met with no success at the Diet, before which he pleaded the cause with much earnestness and enthusiasm. The assembled legislators refused to listen to him after several of his speeches. They adduced vague and flimsy and illusive pretexts against his motion. He therefore turned directly to the men of his own canton, and succeeded in gathering a fairly large troop of soldiers. These were incorporated in the army of the Pope. The first expedition against the Turks mis-

carried owing to dissension amongst the leaders. The Pope then entrusted the command of all the troops to Don Juan, of Austria. On September 16, 1571, he took command of the combined fleet, and after three days of fasting and prayer, lifted anchor. The Swiss Guards, as we learn from the monumental "History of the Papal Navy in the Middle Ages," by Padre Gugliemotti, O. P., sailed with Don Juan on the flagship of the fleet. They fought bravely and well, though poorly protected by their cuirasses. The Christian fleet was composed of three hundred vessels and eighty thousand men, of whom thirty thousand were armed for battle. The Mussulman fleet was made up of two hundred and fifty vessels, with one hundred and twenty thousand warriors, under the command of Ali Pasha. The battle began about noon on October 7; all afternoon the battle went on. At 5 P. M. the victory was won! Twenty-five thousand infidels had fallen; five thousand were taken prisoners; twelve thousand Christian captives were delivered from slavery; one hundred and thirty vessels fell into the hands of the victors—the others were destroyed. Only one Swiss soldier fell during the entire engagement. Another Swiss, Henry Roelli, of Kriens, distinguished himself by snatching two banners from the flagship of the Turkish fleet, which he carried in triumph to Rome. But the victory was not won by arms alone. Pius V. knew that "more things are wrought by prayer than this world lists of," and his favorite prayer was the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, which he never tired of saying, because he was a Dominican. This superb victory is, with justice, ascribed to the intercession of the Rosary Queen, and St. Pius V., the Pope of the Rosary, instituted the feast of the Most Holy Rosary to commemorate the gratitude of Christendom towards Mary. When Marc Anthony Colonna, who had commanded the troops from the Papal States, arrived at Rome on December 13, 1571—Don Juan preferring to remain in the close vicinity of Cyprus—he was received with the greatest joy by Pope and people. In the procession which defiled before the Pope the Swiss were easily recognizable, for to them Colonna had entrusted forty of the leading captives, among whom were the children of the fallen Ali Pasha. And the Pope, in the fullness of joy and gratitude, broke out in the words: "Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Joannes."

EUSTACE HAMPOOLE, O. P.

THE METAPHYSICS OF PRAGMATISM.

“**S**AY that by it I hoped to round out my system, which now is too much like an arch built only on one side,” wrote Professor James in a memorandum a short while before his death in August, 1910, directing the publication of this volume,¹ in which he exposes the metaphysics of Pragmatism, and which, unfortunately, he was never able to complete.

For years James had cherished the purpose of stating coherently and systematically his views on the fundamental problems of metaphysics. He realized the fragmentariness of his empirical descriptive studies of mental phenomena, the importance of many problems suggested, but not usually amplified there. He saw the inevitable demand which the science of psychology makes for a further philosophical discussion of these questions. At the same time, his former works, with their statements of facts and laws scientifically established, offered a basis to which this special discussion could constantly refer for its own grounds in experience.

As occasion offered, it is true, Professor James had gone more deeply into some of these questions, e. g., in his volumes on “Pragmatism” and “A Pluralistic Universe.” But their interconnection and their bearing upon other problems remained to be established. And this he undertakes to do in the present volume and carries out with a systematic conciseness and clarity begotten of long meditation and deepening insight. As the most mature expression of his thought, it is of special value to the student of philosophy.

It is the study of the universe at large, not so much the description of its details, that we aim at in a consideration of these larger problems. If such a study meets at times with decided hostility in certain quarters, if the earnest seekers after elusive solutions have to suffer not infrequently “from man’s native rudeness of mind which maliciously enjoys deriding long words and abstractions,” and the philosopher is likened to “a blind man in a dark room, looking for a black hat that is not there,” James’ genial attitude towards all such “deriders of wise men” is well calculated to take the edge off their pointed shafts.

Philosophy in the full sense is only “man thinking,”² thinking about generalities rather than about particulars; and if he find matter for puzzle and astonishment where no one else does, it can scarcely be denied that it is an essential part of a liberal education to know the chief rival attitudes towards life, as the history of

¹ “Some Principles of Philosophy,” by William James. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1911.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

human thinking has developed them and to have heard some of the reasons they can give for themselves. "At a technical school a man may grow into a first-rate instrument for doing a certain job, but he may miss all the graciousness of mind suggested by the term liberal culture. He may remain a cad and not a gentleman, intellectually pinned down to his one narrow subject, literal, unable to suppose anything different from what he has seen, without imagination, atmosphere or mental perspective."³

And as to the first whence and the last whither of the cosmic process, men will always eagerly inquire. Besides, how many metaphysical problems confront us, lying, as it were, midway between those two extremes? What is thought, and what are things? How are they connected? What do we mean when we say truth? How can there be a world at all, and might it as well not have been? What is God? How are mind and body joined? Do they act on each other? How does anything act on anything else? How can anything change or grow out of another thing?

Or we may summarize all these questions and many others like them, with Kant, thus: What can I know? What should I do? What may I hope?

It is on the answer to the first of these three questions that depend the answers that have been given in the past and shall be given in the future to the others. The limits and validity of our knowledge have thus become the foundation of all metaphysics.

James' metaphysics accordingly may be summed up in two words: the limits and validity of our knowledge are established by the pragmatic rule; and this in turn leads us in the end to conceive the cosmos as a pluralistic universe.

I.

Rationalism and empiricism, according to James, have filled the history of metaphysics with their warfare. Rationalists are the men of principles; empiricists the men of facts. Rationalist thinking proceeds most willingly by going from wholes to parts, deducing facts from principles, while empiricist thinking proceeds by going from parts to wholes, and explains principles as inductions from facts.⁴ Thus Plato, the arch-rationalist, explained the details of nature by their participation in "ideas," which all depended on the supreme idea of the "good."

Rationalist theories are usually optimistic, supplementing the experienced world by clean and pure ideal constructions, and claiming absolute finality for their system. Aristotle and Plato, the

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

scholastics, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant and Hegel, are examples of this.

The temper of finality is foreign to empiricist minds. They aim at accuracy of detail rather than at completeness and are contented to be fragmentary. If they are dogmatic about their method of building "on hard facts," they are willing to be skeptical about the conclusions reached by the method at a given time. Socrates, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, the two Mills, F. A. Lange, J. Dewey, F. C. S. Schiller, Bergson and other contemporaries are specimens of this type.⁵

If this classification seems rather arbitrary to us, suffering as it does from overgeneralization, it is in the latter camp that James himself takes his stand. His psychological theory of cognition hinges on the distinction between percept and concept. "Things" are known to us by our senses and are called "presentations," to distinguish them from the "ideas" or "representations," which we may have without the help of our senses. The former may also be called sensations or percepts, feelings, intuition, the immediate flux of conscious life. The latter may be called concepts or thoughts. Sensation and thought in man are mingled; concepts flow out of percepts and into them again. Percepts are continuous, concepts are discrete; not in their being, for conception as an act is part of the flux of feeling, but discrete from each other in their several meanings. Each concept means just what it singly means, and nothing else. The perceptual flux as such, on the contrary, means nothing, and is but what it immediately is, a much-at-once, with no distinct boundaries, but showing duration, intensity, complexity or simplicity, interestingness, excitingness, pleasantness or their opposites.

Out of the aboriginal sensible muchness attention carves out objects, which conception then names and identifies forever: in the sky "constellations;" on the earth, "beach," "sea," "cliff," "bushes;" out of time we cut "days and nights;" we say *what* each part of the sensible continuum is, and all these abstract *whats* are concepts. The intellectual life of man consist almost wholly in this substitution of the conceptual order for the perceptual order in which his experience originally comes.⁶

The expression of the unvarying relations which the mind discovers between abstract concepts and the combination of them gave rise to various sciences. The value of these rests chiefly on the immutable character of the propositions they are composed of, as it raises them above the mere particular, transient facts.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 37.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

This, according to James, is the rationalistic view; and because under this appellation he has included such widely divergent thinkers as Aristotle and Kant, he accuses rationalists of admitting that it is impossible to explain such concepts as God, perfection, eternity, infinity, immutability, identity, absolute beauty, truth, justice, freedom, necessity, duty, worth, as results of practical experience, as having their origin in sensible perception.

The empiricist view, he claims, holds that they do result from practical experience. And truly, Aristotle and the schoolmen would willingly subscribe to this particular dogma of James' empirical creed. *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu* was their oft-repeated slogan. And it is strange that James should have been unaware of this point or should have failed to grasp its full meaning.

But a more important question than that of the psychological origin of our concepts is that of their empirical use and value—the epistemological question of their truth.

In a concept, James holds, we must distinguish its *function* and its *content*. The concept "man" is three things: 1, the word itself; 2, a vague picture of the human form which has its own value in the way of beauty or not; 3, an instrument for symbolizing certain objects from which we may expect human treatment when occasion arises. Similarly, of triangle, cosine—they have their *substantive* value, both as words and as images suggested; but they also have a *functional* value whenever they lead us elsewhere in discourse.⁷ Whatever its substantive value may be, the more important part of a concept's significance consists in the consequences to which it leads. And these may either lie in the way of *making us think* or in the way of *making us act*. Hence the use of the *pragmatic rule* in the interpretation of concepts. The Pragmatic Rule is: test every concept by the question: what sensible difference to anybody will its truth make; and you are in the best possible position for understanding what it means, and for discussing its importance. If questioning whether a certain concept be true or false, you can think of absolutely nothing that would practically differ in the two cases, you may assume that the alternative is meaningless, or that your concept is no distinct idea.

This rule applies to concepts of every order of complexity, from simple terms to propositions uniting many terms. "Particular consequences are the only criterions of a concept's meaning, and the only test of its truth;"⁸ in other words, the significance of concepts

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

consists always in their relation to perceptual particulars;⁹ their essential office is to coalesce with percepts again, to bring us back to the fullness of original reality; the perceptual flux from which they have been originally distilled, and which is self-sufficing, as all lower creatures in whom conscious life goes on by reflex action sufficiently show.

The ascribing of causes to events and the uniform conditions that regulate those causes, as is done in physical science; the establishment of comparisons and identifications, as is done in mathematics; in short, the substitution of concepts and their connections for the immediate perceptual flow, widens enormously our mental panorama. Had we no concepts, we should live simply "getting" each successive moment of experience, as the sessile sea-anemone on its rock receives whatever nourishment the wash of the waves may bring. But with concepts we go in quest of the absent, meet the remote, actively turn this way or that, bend our experience and make it tell us whither it is bound. We change its order, run it backwards, bring far bits together and separate near bits, jump about over its surface instead of ploughing through its continuity, string its items on as many ideal diagrams as our mind can frame. All these are ways of *handling* the perceptual flux, and *meeting* distant parts of it; and as far as this primary function of conception goes, we can only conclude it to be a faculty super-added to our barely perceptual consciousness for its use in practically adapting us to a larger environment than that of which brutes take account. We *harness* perceptual reality in concepts in order to drive it better to our ends.¹⁰ But these concepts must never be treated as if they gave a deeper quality of truth. The deeper features of reality are found only in perceptual experience: here alone do we acquaint ourselves with continuity or the immersion of one thing in another; here alone with self, with substance, with qualities, with activity in its various modes, with time, with cause, with change, with novelty, with tendency and with freedom.¹¹

How this return to the primitive flux of life, to the flow of feeling, "proves the essential identity of philosophy with science,"¹² is indeed hard to understand. For science is nothing if not a carefully built up system of fixed and immutable laws, far removed from the uncritical flow of the perceptions that come and go unceasingly in our daily life, and do not wholly leave us when we are asleep. It is also fallacious to think that this brings us in a closer contact with reality, with things as they are, unless we

¹⁰ P. 65.

¹¹ P. 97.

¹² P. 101.

admit James' *a priori* idealistic assumption: that things are nothing but our percepts: "Certain grouped sensations are all that corporeal substances are known as; therefore, the only meaning which the word 'matter' can claim is that it denotes such sensations and their groupings."¹³ But this seems merely the supreme effort of idealism *aux abois* to bring us in contact with things at any price whatever, even if it be at the sacrifice of reason. As for the Pragmatic Rule, that practical consequences are the only test of a concept's truth, that we must value doctrine according to its result in conduct, James himself shows how arbitrary the application of it is in the examples he adduces.¹⁴ Thus, he says, when we apply the Pragmatic Rule to the concept "God," we find that it means that "you can dismiss certain kinds of fear." But can we? That alternative supposition that God may exist, that consequently we may not dismiss certain kinds of fear, would be a truth "that makes some particular difference in the course of human experience." Again, to take another example of Professor James, the application of the Pragmatic Rule to the concept "cause" means, he says, "that you may expect certain sequences." But what allows you to assert that they are merely "sequences" and not "products?" You are once more merely begging the question at issue by using the Pragmatic Rule. These examples go to show that the Pragmatic Rule is not what it is claimed to be: an ultimate criterion of truth, that "puts us in the best possible condition for understanding what a concept means and for discussing its importance. On the contrary, it presupposes in the one using it assent to a well-defined philosophical system with all its specific tenets and their consequences.

James' theory of "faith and the right to believe" stands in close relation to his pragmatic doctrine.

In most emergencies we have to act on probability and incur the risk of error. "Probability and possibility" are terms applied to things of the conditions of whose coming we are (to some degree at least) ignorant. If we are entirely ignorant of the conditions that make a thing come, we call it a bare possibility. If we know that some of the conditions already exist, it is for us in so far forth a "grounded possibility." It is in that case "probable" just in proportion as the said conditions are numerous and few hindering conditions are in sight.

When the conditions are so numerous and confused that we can hardly follow them, we treat a thing as probable in proportion to the frequency with which things of that kind occur.¹⁵ Now,

¹³ Pp. 122-123.

¹⁴ P. 62.

¹⁵ P. 226.

the metaphysical and religious alternatives are largely of this kind. We have but this one life to make up our attitude towards them; no insurance company is there to cover us, and if we are wrong, our error, even though it be not as great as the old hell-fire theology pretended, may yet be momentous. In such questions as that of the *character* of the world, of life being moral in its essential meaning, of our playing a vital part therein, etc., it would seem as if a certain *wholeness* in our faith were necessary. To calculate the probabilities and act fractionally, and treat life one day as a farce and another day as a very serious business, would be to make the worst possible mess of it.¹⁶ But is it not a fact made clear by psychological introspection that faith is more than a question of mere probabilities? And does not experience confirm the fact that of many important truths we admit on faith—and we speak here of mere human faith—we are absolutely certain? If we were not—if we were not certain of the existence of the city of Pekin, which we have never seen; of the existence of King George, whom we have never met—innumerable beliefs would be immediately wiped out of our lives as having no truth-value whatever. But human faith gives us a certainty derived from the testimony of others who know from empirical *evidence*. It ultimately rests on as firm a foundation as any one of that small body of truths which we have demonstrated and made evident to our own satisfaction.

Without thrusting in here any discussion of the supernatural—which would be disclaimed *a priori* as non-existent—we may add that religious faith, in the same way, gives rise to an absolute certainty, which also ultimately rests on the authority of those who have seen and heard.

The Pragmatic Rule, therefore, falls very much short of all the advantages claimed for it as a criterion of truth.

II.

We must, however, further consider the use Professor James makes of it when he endeavors to ascertain the ultimate nature of reality.

Monism contends that there is only one being, an all-inclusive absolute, of which all other reality, whether facts or beings, are manifestations, a universe of "each in all and all in each."

To this conception James opposes his theory of "a pluralistic universe," holding that the entire cosmos, instead of being "a genuine unit," is but "a mass."

That this claim is more germane to experience no one will deny.

¹⁶ Pp. 227-228.

As James well says: "The irreducible outness of *anything*, however infinitesimal, from *anything* else, in *any* respect would be enough, if it were solidly established, to ruin the monistic doctrine. And to say that there is no disconnection, that the separations we uncritically accept are illusory—that reality does not exist in the shape of *eaches*, *everys*, *anys*, *ethers*, but only in the shape of an *all* or a *whole*, is on the face of it simply silly, for we find practical disconnections without number. My pocket is disconnected with Mr. Morgan's bank account and King Edward's mind is disconnected with this book."¹⁷

And James very pointedly punctures those vague hankerings after a "unity that is indescribable," after that wonderful, mystical "One" as exemplified not only in Plotinus and in Hindooism, but also in many modern pantheists.¹⁸

Scholasticism, as he properly remarks, always stood for the doctrine that the universe forms a pluralism from the substance-point-of-view.¹⁹ But, he says, its doctrine was too uncritical; for what does the use of the Pragmatic Rule tell us about the concept "substance?" What difference in practical experience is it supposed to make that we have each a personal substantial principle? This difference, that we can remember and appropriate our past, calling it "mine." What difference that in this book there is a substantial principle? This, that certain optical and tactical sensations cling permanently together in a cluster. The fact that certain perceptual experiences do seem to *belong together* is thus all that the word "substance" means.²⁰

In the same manner the "oneness" affirmed of the world is merely a name like "substance," descriptive of the fact that certain *specific and verifiable connections* are found among the parts of the experiential flux. All the "oneness" in the universe is a cognitional "oneness," or, as James puts it, through conceptual abstraction we get "what the oneness of the world is known as."²¹

Things do not *belong together*, but are merely connected by the bare conjunctions "with" or "and."

Does this not jeopardize the world's rationality and invalidate all formulation of scientific laws? No, "for it is sufficient that when oneness is predicated it shall mean definitely ascertainable conjunctive forms."²² This leaves room for "possibility," "novelty," "freedom," notions so native to our common sense. "Free will

¹⁷ Pp. 114-115.

¹⁸ Pp. 116 ff., 138 ff.

¹⁹ P. 119.

²⁰ P. 123.

²¹ P. 132.

²² P. 143.

means nothing but real novelty; so pluralism accepts the notion of free will."²³ As a consequence pluralism is neither optimistic nor pessimistic, but melioristic. While monism is a more emotional and religious view of the world, admitting that the world is saved already by its union with the divine absolute, pluralism is a more moral view, in this sense that it puts morality more in the foreground, and "thinks that the world may be saved on condition that its parts shall do their best."²⁴

And it solves the problem of evil which remains a puzzle for monism; for if the absolute be the all-good, if Perfection be the source of all things, how should there be imperfection? For pluralism the problem of imperfection presents only the practical problem of how to get rid of it.²⁵

Still, the question recurs. if free will exists, if "novelty" may be freely introduced in the world, are we not driven to the conclusion that, "what comes, may have to be treated as a matter of chance," thus again defeating all our aims at scientific accuracy. We are led then to ask: in what manner does new being come? Is it through and through the consequence of older being, or is it a matter of chance so far as other being goes?

"So far as physical nature goes, few of us experience any real temptation to postulate any real novelty. The notion of eternal elements and their mixture serves us in so many ways that we unhesitatingly adopt the theory that primordial being is unalterable in its attributes as well as in its quantity, and that the laws by which we describe its habits are uniform in the strictest mathematical sense."²⁶

"It is when we come to human lives that our point of view changes. It is hard to imagine that 'really' our own subjective experiences are only molecular arrangements, even though the molecules be conceived as beings of a psychic kind. A material fact may indeed be different from what we feel it to be; but what sense is there in saying that a feeling which has no other reality than to be felt is not as it is felt?"²⁷

Thus again, while chance happenings are banished from the physical universe, liberty is assured to man.

One more difficulty remains to be removed. "The classic obstacle to pluralism has always been what is known as the principle of causality. This principle has been taken to mean that the effect in some way already exists in the cause. If this be so, the effect

²³ P. 140.

²⁴ P. 142.

²⁵ P. 138.

²⁶ P. 150.

²⁷ P. 151.

cannot be absolutely novel, and in no radical sense can pluralism be true."²⁸ Aristotle, who made the first definite inquiry into causes, held that the "why" of anything is furnished by four principles: the material, formal, efficient and final cause. But what one generally means by the cause of anything is its "efficient" cause. "It is scholastically defined as 'that which produces something else by a real activity proceeding from itself.' This is unquestionably the view of common sense, and scholasticism is only common sense grown quite articulate."²⁹

The scholastic doctrine certainly obviated the difficulties of monism, for which causation is merely a deducing of the identical from the identical. Scholasticism allows of effects that are really "products," that are really new, and yet not "chance products," for *quidquid est in effectu debet esse prius aliquo modo in causa*. Scholasticism always respected common sense and escaped the frank denial of all genuine novelty by the vague qualification *aliquo modo*. This allowed the effect to differ *aliquo modo* from its cause.³⁰ Yet, after acknowledging this much, James, under the pressure of an idealism from which he sees no escape, goes on to stultify this concept of causality because it is incomplete, because it does not include the essential note of activity.

This concept being an abstraction, it evidently does not include the note of activity as something immediately real, immediately experienced. In order then to get causality in all its completeness, James reduces it to a mere subjective feeling as experienced in the flux of life: "There is doubtless somewhere an original perceptual experience of the kind of thing we mean by causation. Where is this typical experience originally got? Evidently it is in our own personal activity-situations. In all of these what we feel is that a previous field of 'consciousness,' containing (in the midst of its complexity) the idea of a result, develops gradually into another field in which that result either appears as accomplished or else is prevented by obstacles against which we still feel ourselves to press. As I now write I am in one of these activity-situations. I 'strive' after words which I only half prefigure, but which, when they shall have come, must satisfactorily complete the nascent sense I have of what they ought to be. Some of the words come wrong, and then I feel a resistance, not muscular, but mental, which instigates a new instalment of my activity, accompanied by more or less feeling of exertion."³¹ In such a continuously developing experiential series our concrete perception

²⁸ P. 190.

²⁹ P. 191.

³⁰ P. 193.

³¹ Pp. 210-211.

of causality is found in operation. If the word have any meaning at all, it must mean what we there live through. "The percipi in these original experiences is the *esse*. If there is anything hiding in the background, it ought not to be called causal agency, but should get itself another name."³²

The fact remains, however, that these "perceptual experiences of causality" would mean nothing to us, would make no difference in our lives, to apply the Pragmatic Rule, if they were not conceptually apprehended, seized upon abstractedly from the here and now. The search for real causes in science and philosophy would dwindle to an enumeration of phenomenal antecedents; there would not even be a "search," for the word would have no meaning for a being not endowed with the power of abstraction.³³ Moreover, this conception of causality is narrow and fragmentary in that it arbitrarily refuses to go beyond self, to be verified in the external world.

For granted that this is a pluralistic universe, whence is it? The question harasses the mind even more than it does in a monistic system whose absolute is eternal and is continuously evolving phenomenal realities.

In a "piecemeal universe," where causation plays a real part, where the mind is constantly pursuing effects until it discovers the ultimate why of the last product, the thinker cannot escape the problem of an ultimate Being. Here James' philosophy falls lamentably short; all his subtle powers of reasoning seem to abandon him, and he agrees that there is no answer whatever to the question. "No one has intelligibly banished the mystery of *fact*. Whether the original nothing burst into God and vanished, as night vanishes in day, while God thereupon became the creative principle of all lesser beings; or whether all things have foisted and shaped themselves imperceptibly into existence, the same amount of existence has in the end to be begged by the philosopher. . . . For all of us *fact* forms a datum, a gift, or *Vorgefundenes*, which we cannot burrow under, explain or get behind. It makes itself somehow, and our business is far more with its what than with its whence or why."³⁴

That this is one of the weakest spots in James' metaphysics no one will deny, and James himself is well aware of it. There being no infinite primal cause—which would be absurd, he says, since infinity connects with number—James is finally driven to

³² P. 213.

³³ It may be seen from the foregoing that James' ideas are closely connected with those of Bergson; and indeed he himself claims intellectual kinship with this writer.

³⁴ Pp. 44-45.

admit that "reality must in the end be begged piecemeal, not everlastingly deduced from other reality."⁸⁵ All concepts of the infinite he considers as inwardly absurd and contradictory, and "it is better to accept the opaquely given data of perception according to which additions to reality come in finite and perceptible changes like the successive drops by which a cask of water is filled when whole drops fall into it or nothing."⁸⁶

As an argument against the monistic hypothesis James' criticism of the infinite is final: "a total is made up of parts, and parts are numerable, if not actually, at least potentially; if not by the imagination, then at least by the mind. But it is of no value when directed against an infinite *a se*, a being that is outside of space and time, and consequently does not fall within the categories of a standing or a growing infinite. That a finite mind cannot know such an infinite is indeed "but a pseudo-problem." As the infinite is of a kind that transcends all being we have any immediate knowledge of, it can be conceived only by a process of analogy and negation, based, however, on perceptual experience.

In the last analysis, then, the pluralistic universe is one to which there is no whence, no whither.

Even the most biased thinker will hardly be satisfied with this arbitrary assumption and this truncated metaphysics. For it means the complete abdication of reason, which must no longer seek for an explanation; which must no longer seek to know things in general by their *ultimate* causes in so far as natural reason can attain to such knowledge; but must confine itself to a mere *description* of the universe in its details—the very task that James himself deprecates as outside the scope of metaphysics.

Moreover, if conduct is the most important thing in life, as Pragmatism holds, the whence and the whither of the cosmos and of man make so great a difference in our existence that Pragmatism falls double short in failing to take account of them.

J. B. CEULEMANS.

Moline, Illinois.

⁸⁵ P. 165.

⁸⁶ P. 172.

IRISH DRAMA AND IRISH VIEWS.

TENNYSON hailed Milton as a "God-gifted organ voice of England." How far Milton was a very great poet is one question; how far he is rightly to be called a "voice of England" may be another. In the same way certain recent "Irish" plays may be discussed with reference to their abstract value as works of art or with reference to the genuineness and completeness of their inspiration as pictures of Irish life. The two fields of consideration are, indeed, not capable of distinct and absolute delimitation; yet different they are and their separate investigators may possibly arrive at conclusions not easy to reconcile.

The numerous dramas of various kinds, but all with Irish scenes as their background and Irish individuals for their characters, which have lately become in America and elsewhere prominent objects for discussion, appear to my mind far too vast a theme for any single paper, even if the problems involved were not (as they often are) such as it is peculiarly difficult for contemporaries to solve. I ask permission, therefore, to contribute to the views already abundantly expressed as to these dramas, the views of one Irishman who has found the solace of many a leisure hour in the original drama of Greece, Spain, Italy, France, Germany and England, one who has studied since its commencement this dramatic movement and who knows well the Ireland it purports to depict—his views upon the value, as pictures of Ireland, of the characteristic drama given us by that movement—upon this only, with but casual references to the other question of their purely literary merit.

I will, therefore, not proceed to dispute the general value of the high commendations passed on each other's work by various representatives of this new Irish movement—for example, by Mr. Yeats on Mr. Synge's—nor of those which (as I fully admit) outsiders of high competence have bestowed on the productions of both and others. I wish to inquire how far Ireland has refused, and how far she may have justly refused, to recognize in the new drama a fair portrait of herself—a presentation to the world of what she genuinely was in any stage of her immemorial life.

I do not think I am fairly chargeable with any passionate one-sidedness or injustice in doing this. No doubt the time for perfectly cool academic appraisal has scarcely yet come. It is difficult to expect any one (especially any Irishman) to "talk the language of posterity" about "The Playboy of the Western World" and like productions, while fervid Irishmen in New York are receiving them with turnips and bad eggs, and while the London press is

assuring us that never was Ireland so truly and happily represented as by the parricides and viragoes of Synge's plays. But I have always been inclined to deprecate extreme demands for theatrical idealization, always inclined to support the artist's plea for elbow-room, always slow to join the decriers while there was anything praiseworthy to be found. It is with regret and without passion that I speak of the Abbey Theatre plays as a systematic propaganda of calumny. I am speaking of facts, not of intentions. I do not wish to involve in one indiscriminate charge all who have in any way taken part in the theatrical movement during the past twelve years. But the dramatic movement, as a whole, is calumnious, and as a whole is certainly not inconscient.

I will touch on the second point first. The *coryphaei* of the movement know perfectly well what they are doing. Neither in Mr. Yeats, nor in Mr. Moore (his quondam coadjutor), nor in others who might be mentioned, have we the "sweet, gushing child of nature," who "sings but as the linnets sing." As long ago as 1901 Mr. Stephen Gwynn remarked that Mr. Yeats, "the head and forefront of the whole movement," "understands to perfection the arts of the propagandist." He said many amusing things about Mr. George Moore as a person who "has the talent of awakening controversy," who at no period could be restrained from playing to the London gallery, and whose occupation at that juncture might be described as that of standing on his head (metaphorically) to attract public attention. He tells us how Mr. Yeats called Mr. Martyn's "Heather Field" "a masterpiece unique in modern prose-drama," and how Mr. Moore declared that "no one except Shakespeare and Mr. Yeats had successfully written a blank-verse drama." Even the most academic observer of contemporary literature could not fail to observe how effectively this combined boldness and adroitness in mutual self-advertisement has been kept up by the leaders of the Abbey Theatre enterprises. As for the American press and people, whom I may describe, without unbecoming flattery, as singularly alive to the points of effective business propaganda, they recognized and appreciated from the start this aspect of the new enterprise. They realized that they had among them in Mr. Yeats a gentleman whose standing as a great dramatist might be doubted, but who certainly was a first-class showman. I have by me a large number of cuttings from American papers and also notes of the communications made by Mr. Yeats concerning the success of his tours in America to the Irish press at home. It might be amusing, if space permitted to quote from these records, and note how skillfully "successes" were worked up out of sometimes rather unmanageable facts. It would be unfair, of course,

in ordinary circumstances, to make much out of this, and absurd to treat as necessarily criminal the arts by which in this competitive world High Art itself (in the largest of capitals) must often depend for its pot-boiling capabilities. It is worth dwelling on only that a warning may be recorded against the too literal acceptance from the mouths of the Abbey Theatre propagandists of assurances with regard to their triumphs elsewhere. America ought not too hastily accept Mr. Yeats as the sole trumpet of Irish opinion on dramatic matters. America ought not too simply believe on Mr. Yeats' assurance that Ireland has taken to her bosom, as a genuine offspring, the "Irish" dramas represented by Synge's, and that only an "old man" here and there ventures to question the new family arrangements.

From the beginning the Irish dramatic enterprise, of which the Abbey Theatre and its company is the chief, though not the sole representative, has deserved the credit of being managed with much skill and ability. We may recall its history, in order to discuss a few points in its theory. Some thirteen years ago Mr. Yeats, Mr. George Moore and Mr. Martyn appeared in Dublin in the character of apostles and founders of a new theatrical life. The new stage was to be fresh, racy of the soil, full of Irish life. Mr. Yeats told the public that his "Countess Cathleen" was "an attempt to mingle personal thought and feeling with the beliefs and customs of Christian Ireland. Ireland has already many moving songs and ballads which are quite her own. The 'Countess Cathleen' is an attempt to unite a more ample method to feeling not less national, Celtic and distinctive." The same proclamation was made concerning other works, and support in its name was entreated from all classes, in particular a subsidy from the Corporation of Dublin. How little that was "national, Celtic and distinctive" these works contained, how little respect they showed for "the belief and customs of Christian Ireland," soon became manifest to all. A loud outcry was raised. Mr. Yeats was ready with explanations. The old professions were practically thrown overboard and all difficulties were explained away by means of "symbolism." If Irish peasants were represented as miserable poltroons, ready to sell their souls for bread, this was merely an allegory—it was simply mistaking the end of a work of art to suppose that this was a picture of anything "national, Celtic and distinctive." If Irish peasants were represented as kicking to pieces a shrine of the Blessed Virgin, this should not excite any indignation; it is foolish to imagine that this is meant as a representation of "the beliefs and customs of Christian Ireland." During twenty years this same ingenious dodging between realist pretension and

symbolic excuses has been recurrent. In 1905 Mr. Yeats wrote in "Samhain"—a little paper exclusively devoted to Abbey Theatre propaganda—that the art of Synge and similar pessimist drama gives the truth as to the Irish peasantry, while the "sentimental" and "bourgeois" mind of writers like Gerald Griffin and Kickham simply disguised it under "conventional idealism." On another occasion misrepresentation is acknowledged and is glorified. "The misrepresentation of the average life of a nation that follows of necessity from an imaginative delight in energetic characters and extreme types enlarges the energy of a people by the spectacle of energy." But why, one is at once tempted to inquire, are the extreme types all at one particular extreme? And how, we ask again, are we to expect "the energy of a people" to be "enlarged" by the contemplation of such deplorable types as occupy the larger share of the "Abbey" stage? A little later on we find Mr. Yeats taking up the bold attitude that misrepresentation of our people is nothing blameworthy. "After all," he writes—still in the same number of "Samhain"—"if our plays are slanders upon their country; if to represent upon the stage a hard old man like Cosgar or a rapacious old man like Shan, or a faithless wife like Nora Burke, or to select from history faithless Gormleith, for a theme is to represent the nation at something less than its full moral worth; if every play played in the Abbey Theatre now and in time to come be something of a slander, is anybody one penny the worse?" Mr. Yeats, in other words, wants, without quitting his professions of truth and reality, without quitting his hopes of generous subsidies from Irish purse-holders, to be at liberty to patent new types of stage Irishmen for the amusement of the foreigner. No less extraordinary a plea has been offered for the hideousness of "The Playboy of the Western World" by Mr. Yeats' distinguished associate, Lady Gregory, who tells us that this play may be regarded, if not as a picture of the present, then as a prophecy of the future. "Emigration," writes Lady Gregory, "is carrying off year by year the strongest, the most healthy, the most energetic, and some day it may not be a prophecy, but a commonplace that man coming with a name for strength and daring even in crime may take the mastery of a feeble countryside." Surely, with all deference to Lady Gregory's judgment, we could afford to wait for these horrors till they come! Is there really so little in the past or present of Ireland worthy of our dramatists' attention, that they must needs focus their eyes upon the hypothetically sordid, base, ugly and deformed? Are we so completely lacking in illustrations of goodness and nobility that past, present and future must be ransacked to exhibit us as moral lepers?

Again and again Mr. Yeats and his friends have exhorted us to patience in the name of all the arts and all the muses. We are "misunderstanding the nature of literature," we are "denying the right of the individual mind to see the world in its own way," we are "insisting on a bourgeois timidity and insincerity." In all honesty I do not think Ireland can be fairly asked to take the matter in that high academic way. We are susceptible to calumny; and I think we are rightly so. Ireland is not a big, strong country that can, as it were, bully others into admiration of her good qualities. She cannot, like France, Germany and England, sit serene in her strength and her achievements and care little whether others admire her or not. Nor, finally, can she, like the big countries, trust that the world knows her history, that the world has fairly measured what she is and what she can do. No! The age-long work of the destroyer made an easy road for the inroads of the calumniator. The calumniator has not closed his course to this day. The caricaturist supplies the portraits of us that circulate in millions and form the current opinion of the world. We are not all so pleasantly self-deceived as not to know and recognize this. No doubt the Irishman, especially the roving Irishman, has often been too ready to play the buffoon for a laugh or a liveliness. No doubt, too, he has been often too prompt to emphasize domestic differences in presence of a cynical world. Dr. Johnson, we know, told a Scotch friend that the Scotch were in a conspiracy to cheat the world; "but the Irish, sir, are a fair-minded people; they never speak well of each other." But this spirit of reckless Irish generosity with regard to each other's characters has, I think, happily diminished. Those who indulge in it are the few. Those whom it renders deeply indignant are the millions.

What good reason there is to be indignant at the present moment is sufficiently manifested by the history of such plays as the "Play-boy," the "Well of the Saints" and the "Shadow of the Glen"—the history of their rapturous reception by English audiences and English critics. These judges did not, it would seem, always know very well when to laugh and when to look serious; but, at all events, the scenes and personages put before them struck a chord which was ready to vibrate. Comic or tragic, it was what they wanted. Here were new stage Irishmen as funny and grotesque as the old ones, but up-to-date and quite horribly realistic! Their utmost extravagances of action and speech were hailed as a revelation of the real Ireland which sentimentalists try to hide. They have the satisfaction of finding that what they call with reasonable pride "the Anglo-Saxon race in the United States" has largely followed suit; and the Continent, as always, has seen and settled this Irish

question with the help of glasses made in England. Is it fair in the face of such a state of English and world-wide opinion to ask Irishmen, in the name of academic principles, to put their *imprimatur* on work which is responsible for doing them what they feel to be a grievous wrong?

What is perhaps most depressing and surprising in the general aspect of the recent Irish dramatic output is the degree to which an ugly and melancholy realism, a despondent pessimism, are found to have cast their shadows over the work of younger (nay, even of very young men). I hope and believe that this is a fashion merely, a pose learned from a leader, one which, like other fashions, will pass away. What was natural to Synge—and not particularly Irish in him—has been adopted for their own by a number of young disciples. The fashion is even less Irish than the original inspiration. It is as uncharacteristic of Ireland as the Byronism of English youths eighty years ago was uncharacteristic of England, and we believe it will pass much more quickly than the earlier malady. The best brains among the rising generation are, in fact, already coming to see that unmixed gloom, discord and bitterness make bad art as well as bad ethics; that in any case they make but an ugly caricature of Ireland and her people—of a land whose sorrows are singularly set off by mercurial disposition and by supernatural faith.

But another reason for the singular predominance of these undesirable elements must not be left unmentioned. It is an easily understood one—the selective mind and will of the Abbey Theatre management. How far they have exercised their power of choice and veto I cannot say. But it is no secret in Dublin that that power has powerfully contributed towards the setting up of a strongly-characterized school of drama, that decidedly able works by young authors who were afterwards lucky enough to get their chance elsewhere, and then scored triumphantly, were rejected by the Abbey censors, because they did not sing in tune with the Abbey chorus.

We have been told that Synge's portraits of the Irish peasantry must be truthful because of his close study of the originals. Admitting the fact, the argument is quite fallacious. Minute study of the sayings and doings of others may surely be carried on in very various subjective states, and through very variously-colored mental glasses. The artists of *Punch* or *Judge* very frequently (we have no doubt) make a close study of the personages they depict to the world. But does any one propose to take them as authentic family portraits? Art, good or bad, is always selective. The personal equation cannot be eliminated and is sometimes a

huge factor. It was emphatically so with Synge. Synge used themes named from Ireland to express—himself! That he always expressed himself rather than his subjects is the opinion I have heard expressed by one who has studied him very closely and appears to rank among his strong admirers—M. Maurice Bourgeois.

Was the soul thus expressed in any way characteristic of Ireland?

Sprung of a family of singularly successful office-seekers who came to Ireland from England into the wake of George the First's soldiers, and attained a great number of high posts in a Church abhorred by five-sixths of the Irish people, J. M. Synge approached the age of forty before he had taken the slightest interest in anything Irish. He devoted himself to modern music; he experimented aimlessly in literature; he went to Paris in search of sensations and a livelihood; he devoured great quantities of French literature. It is Mr. Yeats' claim that he first directed Synge's attention to the Aran Isles and to the possibilities for an artist to be gleaned there. Thither, at all events, Synge went, and there he found appropriate and original background, coloring and dialect for the ideas to which his own marked idiosyncrasy and his studies of Parisian life and literature had given soil and nutriment. The result as seen in "Riders to the Sea" is something fresh and surprising—a blend in which the gloom of Synge's own nature is blent with the wildness of Atlantic storms and mists, the pessimism of a Baudelaire with the lingering superstitions of Catholic fisher folk. It is a remarkable amalgam, but one which to those who know Irish life lacks something of the convincing unity and inevitableness of a work of genius. Nor is "Riders to the Sea," short as it is, a masterpiece of construction; it contains at least one glaring improbability.

The foreign influences and elements in Synge's work have been emphatically denied by Mr. Yeats and other of his admirers. Not all the proofs given of it may be equally strong or pertinent. But some witnesses cannot be gainsaid. There is Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue, for example, now librarian of University College, Dublin, who was particularly well acquainted and associated with Synge during his Parisian life. He has more than once put in writing his reminiscences of the man and his impressions as to his art. It was Mr. O'Donoghue who recommended Synge to read Pierre Loti's "*Pêcheurs d'Islande*," the book which proved in Synge's mind the germinal seed of "Riders to the Sea." It is he who has told us of Synge's particular interest in Baudelaire. Eccentric, though without affectation, himself, Synge was much taken with the Parisian poet's labored endeavors to "*épater le bourgeois*." It

was Synge from whom Mr. O'Donoghue first heard a story concerning Baudelaire, which has been quoted more than once, but may perhaps be here repeated: The French poet was fond of surprising his friends as well as the staid middle class; and one day he called on Maxime du Camp with green hair. Du Camp pretended not to notice anything, much to the annoyance of the poet, who finally asked his friend whether he saw anything peculiar about him. "Not more than usual," said Du Camp. "But I have dyed my hair green!" exclaimed Baudelaire. "Oh! everybody's hair is more or less green," replied the critic; "if it were sky-blue, now, that would be a bit strange." The poet dashed out of the room and, meeting another friend who was about to call on Du Camp, said: "Don't go near him to-day; he's in a rotten humor."

Another of Baudelaire's freakish ways was to announce in a matter-of-fact way to any company he happened to be in that he had done something very terrible. Thus he once opened a conversation in a restaurant with the words, "Après avoir assassiné mon pauvre père," to the astonishment of the numerous listeners. It is no very bold flight of fancy to see in this freak of his friend the suggestion of Synge's actual parricide in the "Playboy." But what is to be said of the bold policy of turning the Parisian cynical jest into a reality of Mayo peasant life? What (at all events) of its value as a picture of Mayo peasant life? "To me," writes Mr. O'Donoghue, "the motive of the 'Playboy' always seemed useless and absurd, except as a *réclame*. I do not see any dramatic possibility in it. There is far more in the idea of a fugitive having killed a landlord or agent; for peasants would not unnaturally assume that the murderer had some reason for his crime. But then it is conventional, it is not *outré*, it might not stir the jaded interest of an 'intellectual' audience! Many people, in Ireland and elsewhere, have killed their fathers. But if you can represent the whole countryside as glorying in the deed, you do produce a sort of sensation and create a sufficiently villainous environment in which all kinds of absurdities are possible, and in which you can give free play to your fancy. You may then outrage all the conventions consistently enough."

Mr. Yeats is very angry with those who have pointed out that "In the Shadow of the Glen" has had other sources than study of Irish life in Wicklow. So little, in fact, is the story characteristic of that or any Irish region that it is highly reasonable to point out not only the old fable of the Ephesian Matron, but also Voltaire's *Zadig* (chapter 2) as probable inspirers. The root idea of the "Well of the Saints"—disillusionment as a result of recovery from blindness—is anticipated in a play by M. Clemenceau—

a play with Chinese characters—much more clearly than by anything Synge ever heard of in Arran or in Wicklow.

So long ago as 1901 Mr. Stephen Gwynn gave pretty plainly his views as to the exotic character of the new theatrical movement. Of Mr. Martyn's play he wrote that "every line" bore out the suggestion that the author "was working under the influence of Ibsen and his imitators." Of "Diarmuid and Grania"—a tragedy in which Mr. Moore and Mr. Yeats collaborated—he records the current criticism that the authors "had gone to Irish legend to find in epic tradition the plot of an average French novel." He shows at considerable length that the Irish legend had been mutilated, disfigured, degraded by its modern rehandlers; that for its original beauties and faults, strength and crudity has been substituted the "fadeur" of Parisian corruption masked by heroic names. As for Mr. Yeats' "Countess Cathleen," some one else pointed out that this play was founded on a foreign story picked up somewhere abroad by Mr. John Augustus O'Shea. Synge's favorite author, as we have said, was Baudelaire. Than the "Fleurs du Mal" it would be difficult to conceive a worse breviary for one about to devote himself to the interpretation of Irish peasant life. It was the monstrous reading of a Synge-Baudelaire view of life into the Catholic peasantry of Mayo and Arran that led to such strange monsters as the characters of "The Playboy" and other like plays of the Abbey Theatre repertoire—characters so remote from reality as sometimes to have set actors and readers quite at a loss as to whether they should be interpreted as tragic or as farcical.

How Catholic the Irish peasant is has been a familiar topic—it has recently been emphasized by two writers who rather wish it were otherwise—G. B. Shaw and S. Brooks (in the *Fortnightly*). The Abbey Theatre repertoire of peasant plays is either un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. The latter tendency, however, has been chiefly shown in works that have prudently (so far) been kept off the stage. One of them is Mr. Yeats' "Where There Is Nothing." I myself knew the person whose character and career suggested the piece to Mr. Yeats. He was not of sound mind; but amid varying eccentricities of conduct he remained through life a most devout Catholic. Will it be believed that Mr. Yeats makes him the mouthpiec of an anti-religious anarchism and his adventures an excuse for some rather gross caricatures of things venerated by Catholics?

It is absurd to say that critics like Dr. Sigerson, Mr. O'Donoghue and others (including some not Irish and many not Catholic) when they decline to accept plays such as "The Playboy" are

actuated by a narrow desire to hamper unduly the self-expression in dramatic form of Irish minds. Rather is the very reverse the case. They wish to withdraw Irish drama from a rut of insistence on the ugly and mean. They don't want young dramatists kept in the background or discouraged because they break away from the convention of ugliness and meanness. They do not desire servitude to any convention. Let us by all means have a gallery of types as full and adequate as even a Shakespeare could make them out of the dramatic material provided! The pity is that there is no such gallery of Irish portraits. The grievance is that, as in the days of Vousden's old ballad—we are "unfairly represented;" that types and traits not characteristic of our nation, and at the same time eminently injurious to its good name, are persistently put forward, while numerous types and traits which are genuinely characteristic and highly honorable are wholly or unduly kept in the background. I have heard this argument urged with convincing eloquence by the distinguished president of the National Literary Society. He showed us the Irish peasant as history again and again has shown him—an imperfect human being certainly, but singularly unlike the sordid, mean, mercenary creature, closed to the ideal, dull to the spiritual, grasping of the actual, whom—almost alone—drama after drama of the Irish Literary Theatre has put before us. He told us true tales of self-devotion and self-sacrifice, of the heavenward aspirations, of the deep unworldliness of humble heroes and heroines; tales of conscience obeyed in the teeth of war and famine, of heroism in battle, of heroism under the lash, the pitch-cap and the gallows—tales of courage rising sublime over the racks of persecution and the wiles of proselytism; tales such as no country should forget or suffer to be forgotten. He recalled these incidents of the past with an evident emotion that gained his audience. He complained that of all this, of all that ennobled our island's past, glorified its recent sorrows and gave hope for its future, nothing was to be gathered from the production of these Irish dramatists. These real scenes, these real characters have no place, or almost none, on the boards of the Abbey Theatre. They are unknown to the realism, or symbolism, or whatever it is, of Yeats, Synge, Lady Gregory and their younger imitators—we may omit the name of Mr. George Moore, who has at least retired from the galaxy and dropped his comedy rôle of being a representative of Irish ideas. It is not enough to be assured that this or that dramatist spent months assimilating the ways, beliefs and dialects of the Arran Islanders or that he utilized during a stay in Wicklow his opportunities of overhearing servants' conversation from a room below. Promised portraits and put off with what we

know to be drab or glaring caricatures, we are entitled to deny flatly the author's rank as a Hals or a Reynolds and to inquire why and how he has failed to be either a great reproductive artist or a skillful photographer. Dr. Sigerson, like Mr. Stephen Gwynn, showed how strongly foreign was the inspiration of this so-called national drama, and he spoke with the authority of a specialist of more than one kind of "phobia," more than one kind of "pathia." He spoke of an exotic and morbid preoccupation with sex problems, of the regrettable over-occupation of French literature with such problem-themes—themes which might be a natural if not admirable outgrowth of Parisian and Berlin corruptions, but which are inexcusably out of place in the forefront of Irish national drama. It can hardly be denied that the president of the National Literary Society—a pathologist, a poet and a prose writer—knew what he was talking about. No one who knows anything about him can say that he affords a type of the "sentimental" or the "bourgeois" mind, that he is a narrowly clerical or narrowly provincial person. He must plead guilty, it is true, to being a fervently patriotic Irishman. But must that be taken as a serious disqualification in one speaking of Irish pictures of Irish life? Must we, under pain of folly, prefer the views of persons whose ways and thoughts have been moulded in Paris or London, or who have managed to grow up as aliens and strangers in Ireland itself? America has known among her literary children some, not of least note, whose sympathies and breeding were thoroughly alien to her. Does she (great and independent as she is) endure gladly their being taken as her types and type-portrayers?

GEORGE O'NEILL, S. J.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE IRISH PARLIAMENT RESTORED IN ALTERED SHAPE.

ON THE 29th of July, 1800 A. D., the instrument called the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland, having received the royal signature, became law. But the validity of that instrument never was recognized, from that day until this, by the masses of the Irish people, because they knew that it was procured by the foulest of means. A reign of terror preceded its introduction, martial law was in full blast in many parts of the country and corpses of Irish patriots were swinging from the

bridges of the chief cities in Leinster, Munster and Ulster. One and a half million pounds were spent by the British Parliament, at the instance of William Pitt, Prime Minister, through Lord Castlereagh, in corrupting the Irish members—all Protestants—who were asked to vacate their seats in order to allow the measure to go through, while more than twenty-two millions more were added to the public debt of Ireland and kept in a separate account, to be wiped off gradually, by means of increased taxation, by Irish payments, until two conditions should have been brought about—first, that the two debts should come to bear to each other the proportion of fifteen parts for Great Britain to two parts for Ireland; second, that the respective circumstances of the two countries should admit of uniform taxation. After that they were to be consolidated. They were consolidated in 1817. The Irish debt had increased at that time from 28,545,134 pounds to the enormous total of 112,704,773 millions. Ireland was made to pay for the long wars between England and France, and some smaller countries, from 1800 to 1817—in the bringing about of which she was neither instrumental nor concerned in any way. She was compelled to pay the cost of the Rebellion of 1798, which William Pitt had deliberately gotten up for the ignoble purpose of destroying that independence which Grattan and Lord Charlemont had wrung from the fears of King George and the impotency of his Ministry. She was compelled to pay even for the razor with which Castlereagh, as O'Connell, with savage irony, declared, had cut his own throat. Since the year of the Crimean War (1854-5) the burdens of Ireland, over and above what she should have been called upon to bear, even under the Act of Union, amounted to over three millions a year for a period of many years, as was found by a Parliamentary commission charged with the duty of determining the state of the financial relations between the two countries, about twenty years ago. Its chairman, Mr. Lough, an English Conservative member, so reported to the Conservative Government (Lord Salisbury's) of the time. But despite this astounding revelation of gross injustice no action was ever taken by any Ministry, until the present one acceded to power, either to right the wrong or stop its continuance. Had Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills passed the House of Lords, arrangements would have been made for the cessation of the disgraceful plunder. In the measure now being debated in Parliament there are provisions for a settlement based on equity as between the two countries. But the debt which Great Britain owes to Ireland, in all honor and conscience, cannot be measured by any arithmetical vehicle. She has given of her genius, her blood, her bone and sinew, in the building up of the vast Eastern Empire, to

a degree that is simply immeasurable. Her Wellingtons, her Napiers, her Goughs, her Wolseleys, her Robertses, her Kitcheners, were the props and pillars on which rested the stupendous fabric for more than a century.

Since Ireland fell under the blight of the British connection she never received the benefit of true representative government. Parliaments were held in the early years of the Pale, but the principal legislation enacted in these aimed at the securing of the position of the invaders against the onslaughts of the native Irish and the extirpation of the real owners of the soil, their laws, their language, their nationality, and, later on, their religion. This was the general situation. During the Tudor period a great deal of the legislation enacted in the Dublin Parliament was directed to the object of crippling the industrial growth of Ireland and her commerce on the Continent of Europe, and throwing that commerce into the hands of British traders. To this end a series of laws were passed by the British Parliament and imposed on Ireland. They were known as Poyning's laws, their inventor being an English official who had been sent over to examine into the state of the chief ports in Ireland in regard to exports and imports, and make a report on the subject to the Privy Council and the English Parliament. A most infamous law was passed, on the reception of his report, decreeing that no Irish ship could take a cargo to any foreign port until she had taken out her bills of lading at an English seaport—that is to say, paid heavy toll to England ere she could proceed to do business with any part of the European Continent.

It was the commercial tyranny of England—of which the foregoing instance was but one out of many that could be cited—that at last brought on the agitation that reached its climax in the resolutions passed by Grattan and backed by the Irish Volunteers. The first clash occurred when the English Ministry attempted to force on Ireland a perpetual Mutiny Act—in the same way as Mr. Balfour forced on Ireland a perpetual Coercion Act. (The Act is now dead and its sponsor politically dead.) The Mutiny Act to which the shackled Irish Parliament had assented was to run only for six months, but the British one sent it back with the limitation eliminated and the word "perpetual" substituted. The Irish Legislature resented the alteration and resisted it as well as the pretensions of England to control the commercial policy of Ireland. This was the psychological moment when the spirit of Irish liberty was to be born, for out of that act of English insolence sprang the resolve of Grattan and the Irish Parliament to assert the independence of Ireland in regard to her own legislative affairs, leaving only the link of the Crown between the two countries.

Great as was the change in the moral standing of Ireland, as a separate entity, effected by the winning of Parliamentary freedom by the action of Grattan and the Volunteers, and wonderful the material prosperity which that change brought in the shortlived existence of the independent Irish Legislature, there lay in the apparent benefit the deadly seeds of national poison, as in the fabled gift of Dejanira to Hercules, the poisoned shirt of the monster whom he had slain. Ireland was honeycombed with rotten boroughs when the legislative independence of the Parliament was wrested from Britain, and in these plague-spots in her system was bred the deadly virus that was after a few years of freedom to terminate her career as a self-governing nation. Irishmen of to-day who may feel elated at the prospect of the change now proposed by the British Premier and his Cabinet would do well to study carefully the history of the events in Ireland that led to the extinction of the Parliament won by Grattan and the Volunteers and hailed with such pæans of oratory and patriotic ardor as then thrilled the long-enslaved nation. That history is one of the most useful chapters in the whole world's volume. The grand defect in the new situation created by the triumph of Grattan lay in the fact that it was unable to create a Cabinet responsible to the Irish Parliament, as the English Cabinet was to the Westminster one. Another circumstance unfavorable to the success of any practical attempt to reform the hopeless political situation as to Parliamentary government was the existence of a law forbidding the holding of meetings for political deliberation, and known as the Convention Act. This odious law, which was entirely unknown in England, remained in force in Ireland, it may be remarked, down to about thirty years ago, and was used in O'Connell's time frequently to prevent the holding of meetings in furtherance of the movement for Catholic emancipation.

At this critical period there was dissension in the ranks of the Volunteers over the question of a Parliamentary Reform Act for Ireland, in accord with one which had been enacted for England. Those who were at the head of the movement in Ireland saw that without the coöperation of the Irish Catholics it would be hopeless or futile to move for a reformed Parliament for Ireland. Flood and the Bishop of Derry drew up a Reform Bill for Ireland, but it contained no proposals for the admission of Catholics to the franchise; and so there was no enthusiasm for the passage of the bill on their part. On the other hand, the members of the Irish House of Commons, who were placemen, pensioners or recipients of secret service money from Pitt's corruption fund to the extent of two-thirds of their number, looked at the proposals of the bill with

all the horror of such virtue as animates that class of moralists in similar political crises.

In an address presented by the several Volunteer corps of Ulster to their commander-in-chief, the Earl of Charlemont, it was hinted that it would be necessary to call in the aid of the Catholics if the tyranny of an aristocratic class was to be curbed. Charlemont did not, however, think the time opportune. Although himself a most liberal and tolerant man as to religion, he believed it would only delay that abrogation of the Penal Code which every thoughtful man among the Protestant minority believed to be inevitable, if the country was ever to be happy and prosperous. Charlemont was anxious to have the proposal to hold a National Congress adopted, and he believed that to raise the religious issue at such a juncture would be fatal to the success of the scheme. But neither the idea of emancipation nor that of a National Congress was welcome to the Government, and when Mr. Riley, High Sheriff of Dublin county, called a meeting of freeholders for the purpose of selecting and instructing delegates to such a convention, the Irish Attorney General was instructed to proceed against him in the King's Bench by way of "attachment." The prosecution succeeded in getting the Judges—for there was no jury recognized in such methods of procedure—easily to agree in finding the Sheriff guilty of contempt in summoning such a gathering, and passing sentence of a week's imprisonment on the bold offender and fining him in a small amount. The Government, finding that the move was successful, resolved to try it in other places, to prevent the holding of assemblies as called for by Sheriffs in Roscommon and Leitrim; and the magistrates who had signed the resolutions adopted in these counties were prosecuted as well as the Sheriffs, and both the printers and publishers of such newspapers as had printed the resolutions were included in the indictments. It was not without some apprehension of a reverse that the Government had resorted to the procedure, because although the power of the Judges to prevent public assemblies by writs of "contempt" and putting men in prison without trial was recognized by law, it was rarely resorted to for fear of arousing popular wrath. The Volunteers were still arrayed with their arms ready in the various armories, and a roll of the drum could assemble the hosts in very brief time. Despite the arbitrary action of the Government, the promoters of the National Congress movement succeeded in their design, and a large body of delegates assembled in Dublin in October, 1784. But as it was found to be incomplete in point of representation, it was determined to declare it adjourned, after passing a resolution in favor of the demand for a measure of

Parliamentary reform. The delay in the movement was eagerly seized upon by the secret enemies of Ireland in the British counsels. In religious divisions and sectarian hatred the evil mind of Pitt beheld at once the means whereby he could wrest back the advantage which the cannon and drums of the Volunteers had wrung from the enfeebled hand of Britain. Having perceived the means, he had not the slightest compunction in utilizing them step by step in the development of his secret plan to overthrow the temple of Parliamentary Independence which Grattan and Charlemont and the other leaders of the Volunteer movement had so laboriously reared.

The first excuse for Pitt to begin the execution of his fell design was the appearance of secret society emissaries in the County Kilkenny. They induced the wretched rack-rented peasantry to join in midnight attacks on the abodes of landlords, agents and bailiffs, disguised and swathed in night clothes; hence they were known everywhere as Whiteboys. A good many had previously been formed in Ulster, under the names of "Hearts of Steel," "Peep o' Day Boys" and other fantastic designations. Their purpose was quite different from that of the Whiteboys—it was mainly sectarian. The country around Kilkenny was the scene of many cruel depredations by bands of these desperate men, bailiffs and land agents being usually the objects of their vengeance against the landlords who oppressed them. The wicked folly of these outrages was strongly condemned by Dr. Troy, the then Bishop of Ossory, in a letter to the clergy of his diocese; and as a result the reign of the Whiteboys was not very long in the Kilkenny Diocese; but they sprang up in many other places outside—notably Tipperary and Meath. In Westmeath, later on, the system was firmly and widely rooted, under another name—that of Ribbonmen, and it was not finally uprooted there until about forty years ago. But brief as its existence was in Kilkenny, it gave Pitt the opportunity to introduce the virus of sectarian animosity into the councils of the Irish patriots in many places, particularly in Ulster, and when later on he followed up that success with the more deadly one of sending large numbers of English Orangemen from Lancashire and other countries into Ulster to organize the Protestant inhabitants into secret lodges, with oaths binding members to wage war to the death upon the Catholic population, the seed was sown for that grand coup he had in mind—an armed rebellion by a people, disarmed but desperate, and the destruction of the system of Parliamentary government by Irishmen in Ireland itself.

E The British policy in Ireland, at that melancholy epoch, was dominated by two cardinal ideas, namely, the maintenance of the

Protestant ascendancy, in the concrete form of a duality of visible things, in the shape of an Established Protestant Church and a landed aristocracy owning the greater part of the soil by virtue of conquest and confiscation. The Established Church was also founded on the same iniquitous basis. Even the most fatuous among the ascendancy class could not fail to be persuaded that such a social condition had not the quality of permanency inherent in it. Many conscientious members of the ascendancy class worked strenuously for the principle of equal rights in the franchise, in the professions, in the army and navy, for Catholics; and this generous tendency was one of the reasons why Pitt decided to bring about a condition that under the name of union would make for perpetual discord and disunion. "I will soon set down the pegs that make this music," is the side remark Iago makes when noting the happiness that reunion has brought to his dusky master and his bride on the pier at Cyprus. Iago of the poet's imagination was only a petty villain, as compared with William Pitt of the reality, in political chicane. The commercial and industrial conditions and the fiscal policy arising therefrom in the two islands differed so materially that he could take advantage of the sentiment in regard to both, as a controlling influence in the game that he contemplated playing, if not a paramount one. The British manufacturers at that period clung to the policy of protection for native industry, while the Irish ones, at the same time, demanded free trade in the importation of raw materials and goods partly manufactured; and this opposition of interests played a very large part in bringing about the Volunteer movement and its outcome, the declaration of Parliamentary independence. One of Pitt's pet measures was a treaty of commerce between England and Ireland, and the draft of one was drawn up between Mr. Orde, the Chief Secretary, and certain Commissioners representing Irish industrial interests. Eleven resolutions based upon this draft were submitted to both Parliaments for discussion. They were in their effect more favorable to England than Ireland, yet the British employers and workpeople regarded them in quite a different light and made so loud a clamor over them all over the country that the Prime Minister had to ask for leave to amend the bill by inserting three propositions which in effect reestablished the tyranny of Poyning's Law over Irish commerce and laid down limits of the seas beyond which it should not be allowed to travel in search of trade expansion. When the bill thus mauled and panniered with handicaps on Irish trade came back to Dublin from Westminster, the Irish Government could not succeed in getting a majority strong enough to support it in the division lobbies, and so Mr. Orde, with much

chagrin, allowed it to die a natural death after the first reading. Richard Brinsley Sheridan opposed the bill, although his great colleague, Edmund Burke, favored it. Sheridan saw in it the germs of the sinister thing it was intended to foreshadow—a union with England, and said regarding its purpose and the method of its introduction: "Ireland, newly escaped from harsh trammels and severe discipline, was treated like a high-mettled horse, hard to catch; and the Irish Secretary was sent back to the field to soothe and coax him with a sieve of provender in one hand and a bridle in the other." Sheridan was as keen in his prescience as he was apt in his metaphors. He could plainly perceive what we call "the nigger in the woodpile."

From the first hour of the proclamation of Ireland's rejection of British leading strings the busy brains of Pitt had been at work weaving new excuses for inveigling the liberated country in schemes that would give excuses for piling heavy financial burdens on her shoulders, and she was soon staggering under her load. On the day of her renunciation of British supremacy her national debt was barely four million pounds, and when Mr. Pitt had worked out his bloody plan for her recapture he made her debt stand at twenty-one millions more. One of the chief agencies by which this enormous burden was brought about was the extension of the Pension List to Ireland and the inclusion of Ireland in the war debt of the British Empire—a most iniquitous piece of tyranny, since Ireland had no interest in the matters for which wars were waged and no voice in deciding questions of war or peace in British counsels. Grattan was intensely bitter in his demur to many of the pensions on the list and the persons and purposes for whom and which they were placed there. But to John Philpot Curran went most of the honors of a debate, the most able, fierce and scarifying that ever was heard in any Parliamentary assembly. He said, referring to the motley crowd of domestic and foreign vampires that were put on the list as objects of the royal bounty:

"This polyglot of wealth, this museum of curiosities, the pension list, embraces every link in the human chain; every description of men, women and children, from the exalted excellence of a Hawke or Rodney to the debased situation of the lady who humbly herself that she may be exalted. But the lessons it inculcates form its greatest perfection; it teaches that sloth and vice may eat that bread which virtue and honesty may starve for after they had earned it. It teaches the idle and dissolute to look up for that support which they are too proud to stoop to earn. It directs the minds of men to an entire reliance on the ruling power of the State, that feeds the ravens of the royal aviary, that cry continually

for food. It teaches them to imitate those saints on the pension list that are like the lilies of the field—they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet are arrayed like Solomon in all his glory. In fine, it teaches a lesson, which indeed they might have learned from Epictetus, that it is sometimes good not to be over-virtuous; it shows that in proportion as distresses increase the munificence of the Crown increases also; in proportion as our clothes are rent the royal mantle is extended over us.”

Despite the scathing reasoning of Curran and many other politicians of the first rank, the Pension Bill and the Place Bill—one equally corrupt in its intent and scope and operation—passed the Houses of Parliament, supported, strangely enough, by all the eloquence of Henry Grattan, and were acceded to by the Viceroy. This acquiescence did little credit to Grattan’s perspicuity. If he could have foreseen how deadly the Place Bill could be to that independence of the Irish Parliament which he had labored like Hercules to bring about, it is safe to say he never would have taken the stand he did on that sinister measure.

William Pitt now began to improve the advantage he had gained by the passing of the Place Bill and the Pension Bill, by applying its fruit methodically and practically. He had secured the means whereby to *corrupt*, and he lost no time in beginning the work so necessary to the success of his grand scheme—a Legislative Union. His first important step was the granting of the elective franchise to “forty-shilling freeholders,” without specifying any religious persuasion. This meant qualified emancipation for Catholics, inasmuch as nearly all such poor persons belonged to the Catholic faith. On a petition presented to the Irish Parliament in 1792 the proposal to grant the franchise to Catholics was rejected by 208 votes to 23. Next year, when Lord Westmoreland was Viceroy and Pitt’s corruption fund was being utilized, the proposal to grant the franchise to the forty-shilling freeholders was carried by a big majority. Mr. Pitt’s finesse in this proceeding was Machiavellian in its cunning. He wished to exasperate the Catholics by having their enemies triumph in the first fight, and he succeeded. Then he desired the Catholics to win when the second one came on, and he succeeded, but at the cost of Protestant respect. Both parties felt contempt for him when he won, but he did not care. He was playing to create religious animosity, and he succeeded only too well.

If the palm for political chicanery must be given to William Pitt in regard to his Irish policy, Lord Clare must be assigned the first honors for shameless tergiversation. He spoke almost ferociously on the proposal to give Catholics votes in 1792, saying

it would be a breach of the Coronation Oath and destructive to Church and State to do so; and the following year he both spoke and voted to let them have the franchise! The concession inflamed the minds of the extreme Protestant party and paved the way for the next step in the dark game of "Divide et impera" that Pitt was now playing—the importation of the Lancashire Orangemen and the organization of the secret lodges in Ulster in 1795. To offset this move came the hint to some understrappers to wink at the arrival of French revolutionary agents and allow them to sow the seed of rebellion or Jacobinism in Catholic Ireland. Lord Fitzwilliam, an amiable and wealthy Irish landlord, was sent over as Viceroy to replace Lord Westmoreland. He took immediate steps to inaugurate a liberal and generous regime in Ireland and emancipate the Catholics from every restriction, but to his consternation he found himself outwitted and foiled by the Machiavellian English Minister. He had become a popular idol in Ireland, and at the height of his popularity both he and the people were stunned by the announcement of his recall. As the keen historian, Barrington, puts the case, "the day Lord Fitzwilliam arrived peace was proclaimed throughout Ireland; the day he quitted it she prepared for insurrection." Secret drilling became the order of the day (or rather the night) in almost every county, from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear. Lord Carhampton, Commander-in-Chief of all the British forces in Ireland, found the conduct of the English Prime Minister, in ordering him to take measures to goad the people into a premature insurrection, by means of the lash, the pitch cap and "free quarters" for soldiers, so open and shameless, that he resigned his position. General Abercrombie, his successor, after telling the Government that the British army in Ireland was a terror to everybody but the enemy—that is, the French—also resigned, since he was powerless to check the Reign of Terror which Orangemen, Yeomanry, Hessians and regulars had inaugurated. Then, goaded to madness, the wretched unarmed peasants rose in fury and hurled themselves with rude weapons, pikes and scythes, upon the best armed troops in the world. The sanguinary story need not be gone over. All the world knows what ensued. The single County of Wexford fought with a valor so desperate and indomitable that ere the unequal conflict had terminated there were no fewer than 160,000 troops within its confines, while the whole countryside was strewn with the corpses of the brave men who stood up against the hirelings of Pitt—and many of their wives and daughters had died fighting beside them. The unequal struggle was soon ended, and when the County Wexford and a large part of Ulster were drenched with the blood of the patriots

and the whole country outside was quivering with horror and affright, the heartless contriver of the butchery proceeded to unfold the intention which had animated the ghastly proceeding—a plan for the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland. His emissaries in Ireland, Lord Clare and Castlereagh, took the necessary steps to bribe the members of the House of Commons with money and titles and to bully and intimidate those who could not be bought or cajoled. These measures were effectual, and so the year 1800 saw the end of Ireland as an independent nation, for the time being, after eighteen years of remarkable success in controlling her own affairs as a nation.

The cost of the military operations for the suppression of the revolt in Ireland was six million pounds, and this sum was charged up against Ireland's separate account, on the principle of Brennus' 'woe to the conquered.'

The central injustice of the arrangement miscalled the Union, since it is in practice an Absorption and an autocratic despotism, is the fact that the transaction had the effect of making Ireland bear a proportional share of the enormous load of the National Debt of Great Britain, after the Parliament of Ireland was no longer to be reckoned with in the balancing of accounts between the respective parties to the pact. The financial arrangements proposed in Mr. Asquith's plan to remedy the injustice of the Union are the most interesting and important sections of the measure. They are roughly outlined thus:

The bill provides that the questions to be excluded from the control of the Irish Parliament are the Crown, the army and the navy, imperial affairs, the Irish land purchase and the Old Age Pensions and National Insurance Acts, the Irish Constabulary, the post office savings bank and public loans in addition to those excluded by the Home Rule Bill of 1893, which left the Customs under the control of the Imperial Government.

The collection of all taxes is to remain in the imperial service, and they will be paid into the Imperial Exchequer, which is to pay over to the Irish Exchequer an amount equivalent to the expenditure on Irish services at the time of the passing of the Act.

An additional sum of \$2,500,000 is to be paid to Ireland the first year, and this will diminish by \$250,000 yearly until it is reduced to \$1,000,000.

The postal services are to be handed over to Ireland. The Irish Parliament is to have power to reduce or to discontinue the imperial taxes excepting the income tax and the stamp and estate duties. It will also have power to alter the excise duties; but, except in the case of beer and spirits, it is debarred from adding to the

customs duties anything which will give a greater increase than ten per cent.

We must expect a stiff fight in committee over the details of this complicated scheme of finance. That Ireland has been unjustly dealt with by the operation of the amalgamation called the Union is a very mild way of describing her case. She has been robbed to the verge of national bankruptcy. By the process of legerdemain in dealing with imperial as well as local chargeability, successive British Governments since the Union have kept piling on annual excess charges until the gross total approaches the billion mark. The Childers Commission of 1896 estimated Ireland's contribution in excess of her just share, for 1894 only, at \$14,000,000, and it now approaches \$20,000,000. This excess since the Union was estimated by Lord MacDonnell at seventeen billion dollars, "an empire's ransom." The committee of seven experts—only two of whom are Irishmen—whom the Government appointed last year to inquire into the financial relations of the two countries with regard to the drafting of the present Bill have unanimously declared in favor of Irish control of Customs and Excise and in general of Irish fiscal independence.

The iniquitous means by which Ireland's public expenditures were swelled out, in utter disproportion to her size, her population and her legitimate needs, had their roots in the Place Bill. An army of officials and sinecurists was thereby created. As an illustration, the writer knew a gentleman who for sixty years held the post—almost a sinecure one—of Stamp Commissioner. When he retired, it was on a pension of half his salary (£600 a year); and his eldest son was immediately appointed his successor. He lived many years, too, the result being that the Irish public was paying for about a hundred years to one family a yearly sum that would be sufficient to pay the salaries of half a dozen clerks, any one of whom would be quite competent to discharge the duties connected with the handing out of stamps and the taking in of money for them. No such distension of the public charges was ever attempted in Great Britain. Mr. John E. Redmond, M. P., shows in *McClure's Magazine* how Ireland's apparent deficit in its contributions to the Imperial Exchequer was worked out since the Act of Union. His analysis is searching. This is its kernel:

"The total civil government of Scotland (with practically the same population) was in 1806 £2,477,000, or \$12,385,000. The cost of similar government in the same year in Ireland was £4,547,000, or \$22,735,000. Ireland's judicial system costs £200,000, or \$1,000,000, a year more than the Scotch. The Irish police force costs exactly three times what the police of Scotland costs. The

number of officials in Scotland is 963, with salaries amounting to £311,000, or \$1,555,000. The number of officials in Ireland is 4,539, with salaries amounting to £1,412,520, or \$7,062,600. Per head of the population, the cost of the present government of Ireland is twice that of England, and is far higher than that of Norway, Holland, France, Denmark, Portugal, Sweden, Italy, Spain, Roumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Germany or Russia. In other words, Ireland, probably the poorest country in Europe, pays more for her government than any other nation. The secret of the inefficiency and extravagance is identical, namely, the fact that it is a government not based upon the consent, but maintained in actual opposition to the will of the governed."

It has been stated that Ireland is now being treated with extraordinary generosity in the financial proposals of the Asquith Bill. Mr. Redmond's comparisons do not bear out the verdict. The "generosity" would appear to be akin to the process called "feeding a dog with a piece of his own tail."

Mr. Thomas Lough, M. P., who was chairman of the Commission on Financial Relations under the Salisbury Government, found that Ireland was being robbed, under the juggling system adopted since the Union, to the extent of two and a half million pounds sterling—and that was twenty years ago—golden years for the British parties to the compact, wretched ones for the defrauded.

We note by the latest Irish exchanges that Mr. Thomas Sexton, former member of Parliament for Waterford, has just retired from the post of managing director of the leading Irish paper, "The Freeman's Journal." While he was in Parliament he often rendered effective service in matters in which questions of economy and finance were involved. There ought to be no reason now why he should not seek reelection to the Westminster Parliament, where his fine actuarial skill might be advantageously utilized in the forthcoming debates on the committee stages of the Asquith Bill. He could easily get a seat if he wished to reënter the service of his country. The suggestion is worth some consideration.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE MATERIALIST—A
SUMMER DAY'S DISCUSSION.

A FOREWORD.

WE HASTEN to disclaim our full share of responsibility for either the conduct or the arguments of the disputants in the following pages. True, we conjured them up one fine summer season, from forth the swarm of creatures of the mind, and set ourselves to record whatever should seem worth while writing out of their wordy wars. It was during that dreamy time when pens grow slack and wits begin to wander—and we had not gotten far into the ensuing pages when we began to realize with some pain that neither of our characters was behaving quite as an ideal and docile character should. Dr. Edwards, whom we had taken on his first appearance to be a mild, considerate and persuasive man, was growing far too dictatorial, too cocksure and vehemently disputatious (a thing which, alas! often happens even when one has a righteous cause!) and his speeches were sometimes so unconscionably long that his luckless antagonist would be sure to be half bewildered by the time it came his turn to speak.

Dr. Doone, on the other hand, betrayed a certain lack of definite opinions and a disposition to dodge and tack and waver, which (however well such qualities in him may hold the mirror up to nature) one would rather not see in a man who stands for the great and unhappily growing tribe of "sturdy unorthodox."

Summer leisure gave us no heart, however, for wrangles with rebellious shadows—and so we heard them out and let them have their say, pretty much as each one chose. When all is said and done, their worst defects may be found to have a certain air of nature about them. And if at times they show some personal bias (for two long lifetimes stretch behind our stage's door), or if they seem to slight some argument or overlook some phase of their extensive subject, let us remember that they are, after all, only two physicians in friendly chat, and not disputants upon a studied theme or champions in any formal trial of logic.

What they suggest, far more than what they say, will, we trust, prove helpful to the gentle reader. One more remark, and that not the least important, before our little creaky curtain rises once for all.

The speeches of Dr. Doone are, we may say in general, the more closely copied from nature in proportion as they grow more wild and strange. Where they seem to touch the very climax of un-

likeliness they have been taken almost verbatim from among the fragments of reported or remembered talk!

Let us sketch with a hurried stroke or two the *mise en scène* of this simple drama. We are on the deep and vine-embowered veranda of a cozy cottage on Narragansett Bay. The salty savor of the ocean blows cool upon us, and its waves, always rude and boisterous on this rocky coast, make incessantly a pleasant and murmurous splashing on the shore. Two men have come out into the air to smoke. That brisk, lean, eager-looking man leaning on the veranda railing is Dr. Charles Spencer Edwards, surgeon-in-chief to St. Anselm's Hospital, New York. The square-jawed, clean-featured fellow in the rocker is Dr. John Emory Doone, of the Rockford Institute.

Dr. Doone is deep in the pages of a medical journal. Presently he turns to his companion, who has been watching his eager absorption with an amused smile. "By Jove, Charlie," says he, "you may smile, but this is interesting. Listen here: 'Dr. Thomas Bradford Winslow, the dean of the medical profession in New York city, has just put the crown on his noble toils in behalf of humanity by donating nearly half a million dollars, the earnings of his busy lifetime, to the founding of a tuberculosis hospital in Bronx borough. The records of human service can scarcely point to a nobler example than this. After a lifetime spent in the most fruitful and honorable effort in behalf of humankind, the venerable doctor has ensured that his work shall live and prosper after him—the noblest work which the crash of dogmas and systems has left us—the work of ministering to the needs and sufferings of nature's lord and masterpiece—man.'"

Dr. Doone paused and glanced upward for approval. "Hasn't that the genuine ring about it, Charlie?" said he with enthusiasm. "I suppose you won't like that bit about the 'crash of dogmas,' but setting that aside, is there anything on earth so noble, so worthy of a man's best toil and pains as the medical profession? What are you smiling at? Confound you, isn't that interesting and inspiring?"

"Very interesting, indeed, and very inspiring. But you may thank your stars, you materialists," said Dr. Edwards, puffing very gently on his cigar, "that you have, all of you, the blessed gift of inconsistency." And he looked over at his friend with an expectant twinkle in his eye.

"The gift of inconsistency," repeated Doone, wrinkling his forehead. "Well, I like that; what do you mean by that now?" "I mean, my dear fellow," resumed Dr. Edwards, settling himself

comfortably in a chair and tilting his chin a little, to favor exposition, "I mean that it is a blessed thing for you all that you don't follow your principles out to their logical conclusion—that you happily stop a little short of trying to act on what you hold by, theoretically—or else what a pretty pickle you'd all be in!" Dr. Doone sat up with emphasis and bristled a little. Next to what he called his liberal and strictly scientific principles, it was his chief boast that he was an eminently logical man and rigidly consistent, and this blunt assertion to the contrary acted on him with an unpleasant stimulus.

"You outrageous controversialist!" he cried at the smiling and complacent Edwards. "Prove that against me and I'll grant all the assumptions of the vitalists. You rascal, you; you're spoiling for a dispute."

"I am, I own it," said Dr Edwards amiably; "it is the one thing I need, John, to put the finish on a delightful week. And when I see you there, poring with such solemnity over that absurd materialistic sheet and gulping down its ponderous inconsistencies—by Jove, I feel the proper moment has arrived to floor you."

Doone laughed. He and Edwards had been close friends at the medical school, then had drifted apart a bit, while each was climbing high in his own specialty, until now they had met and renewed their old familiarity again at a friend's cottage on Narragansett Bay. They felt intimate enough to let their friendship bear the strain of an argument—but neither was quite sure of the other's philosophical stand. It sometimes needs a holiday to bring such thoughts to the surface—men seldom discuss their abstract principles when they are in the thick of the concrete businesses of life.

"I'll tell you what, John," Dr. Edwards continued, looking at him meditatively. "What do you say, in real earnest, if you and I thrash out some of these questions in a friendly way during these quiet morning hours on the veranda?"

"I'm more than willing," answered the other, shaking himself up to attention. "I'm all in a wonder what you really think or believe, and how you can square your dogmas with your science. Inconsistent man. Good heavens! What do you call yourself!"

"This materialism of yours," continued Edwards, not noticing the retort. "Did you ever consider to what a level it should logically reduce the medical profession?"

"What level? It leaves it the noblest of Vocations."

"From the standpoint of sentiment—perhaps. But, John, suppose we are, as you think, mere laboratories of chemistry and physics—complex machines—then how does our noble vocation differ, for example—well—from that of the veterinary?"

"How?" snorted Doone. "Every way. The object of our healing art is man—man, the one noble thing in the universe. We heal him, body and mind. Where a century ago he writhed in helpless pain or died like a dog, hopeless and agonized, we with our skillful knife or subtle medicament rescue him, snatch him from agony, make his body wholesome and his pulses calm. And you compare the art which ministers to the health of this lord of creation to the low trade of dosing horses? Shame on you! Their objects are as different as the poles!"

"Very well said," answered Edwards; "but now you're not speaking according to the formularies of materialism. Translated into these, your rhapsody should be something as follows: 'The object of our art is man—man, a curious jumble of complicated physical and chemical phenomena—a ghastly deceit born of chance reactions, which produce the sad illusions of consciousness, of identity and responsibility, where really there is but a helter-skelter of changing atoms, a specious rottenness, crumbling to decay. Where a century ago this unseemly thing fell apart to clean elements, unhindered, we, other fortuities, by a blind development of the same queer chance, dig in our haphazard blades or pour our drug mixtures, and sometimes stave off decay and dissolution, and prolong the melancholy galvanism called life—a little dance of atoms more. With the other equally queer jumble called the horse the veterinary does the same. Behold our dear profession!' And Dr. Edwards leaned back and breathed a bit after his exertions. "Confound it!" said Doone. "You paint the thing too black. A man is a great deal finer thing than a horse, even materially speaking." "There's just your inconsistency," said the smiling Edwards. "Granted materialism—that all things are merely the same matter differently arranged, and there's no such thing as finer or coarser. What's your standard of comparison—complexity? But that's merely making more of a greater chance disorder; that's sentiment, not science. Take things to your laboratory, put aside all prejudice and feeling, boil the human body and the horse's body—or a fly's, for that matter—to their last element, and you find them much the same. The fine arrangement—the complex harmony—what are they but accidents and by the way. The one reality with you is matter—and it is much the same in everything."

"Now stop a bit," said Doone. "What would you say to the monistic theory? Suppose that *all* matter has its own bit of consciousness and purposefulness, in a latent state, ready to flower out into the full nobility of human nature, so soon as it comes into proper contact and relation with other similar units in the great harmonious whole we call a man?"

"Do you bring that argument seriously, John?" asked Edwards, smiling, "or is this a playful digression? You are too sensible a man to postulate a million million souls so as to get rid of one. But leaving aside the fearful contradictions which rise up to damn that wildly fanciful theory, at best it really does not help at all to excuse this glaring inconsistency of materialism. For even granting the monistic theory, all matter is still equally noble, or, if you will, equally degraded. The phosphates in your brain and nerves are really no better and no lordlier now than when they lay inert in the tissues of the fish you ate last fortnight—the mass of matter that we call a man is really no more dignified nor glorious a being now, in the full heyday of his genius, beauty, youth, than he will be half a century hence when he lies—horrid reflection!—in some gloomy vault of a neglected graveyard, hid from the wholesome air. No! no! my dear fellow, your materialists may squirm and wince and build new theories, but so long as everything is matter to them they will have a heavy task indeed to justify the much-harped-on nobleness of man."

"But then there's the long result of Evolution," said Doone, "to explain and justify the nobleness and preëminence of man. He is the last and choicest product of the long processes of nature. He is the fruitage of the years, the ripe result of time. Isn't all that a patent of nobility?"

"A patent of nobility? That all depends on what these long processes have led to, my dear fellow. What, from the standpoint of the out-and-out materialist, has been the upshot of all this age-long preparation? Merely a mass of actions and reactions, a greater complexity, a more amazingly intricate and involved haphazard and confusion. Is the mere complexness, intricacy and the unstable balance of a thousand strange and delicate coincidences, which in your theory evolve a man, anything to rave or wonder at? From simple and stable things to more complex and unstable compounds, last to the most complex and unstable of them all, which we call a man—then by retrogressive stages of swift corruption back to the simpler elements—behold the sum total in the individual instance of materialistic Evolution. It is merely, if one may say so, the process of corruption turned the other way—a slow and complex upbuilding—to pave the way for a sudden and pitiful collapse. But why should we worship man, the medial stage of this dreary process? Why call him the end and flower of evolution? He is a passing stage—the point of highest complexity. The real conclusion of all this dance of atoms is simplicity and corruption once again. The universe tends to become uniform once more as it was in the beginning—a final simplicity, through corruption,

and not the complex stage called man, is the proper goal of materialistic evolution."

"Well," said Doone, "what of it? Can't we admire man, 'the complex stage,' as you call him, while he lasts?"

"What are we to admire anything?" smiled Edwards. "*We* are that complex stage ourselves! We are mere transitions, melting views, dissolving pictures, compounds that vanish as they rise. And if we, transient jumbles that we are, had any right to admire anything, what should we find to admire in the queer freaks that matter is playing all around us? If one sticks to blind fortuity, as well admire the inarticulate gurglings of an idiot's frenzy or the tumbling about of rubbish in a dust heap when the winds are high——"

"But the order, the design, the marvelous adaptation of part to part!" said Doone.

"Order!—design! but what are these to a materialist? Who ordered? Who designed them? You postulate a creator then? Or if matter itself does all, then matter itself is a God. You become a pantheist."

"I see you have the better of me at metaphysics," declared Doone, plaintively. "I confess it; I am no logician."

"John, that's a common plea with you materialists, I notice," said Edwards, "and it seems to me a very flimsy one. Doesn't it occur to you that the reason we get the better of you in logic so often is not that we are better trained in subtleties, but rather that the logic of the thing is really on our side? And why follow logic and common-sense whenever it suits one's convenience and leave its guidance just where it turns us toward unwelcome truths? What if a man should say to you: 'You seem to have the symptoms on your side. I can't refute your diagnosis, but I distrust all symptoms just here—I have fixed views of my own about the case, which I prefer to keep!'"

Doone laughed and threw away his half-consumed cigar. "Perhaps we'd better sleep on this," said he. "My brain may be clearer to-morrow morning. You've gotten me interested anyhow, Charlie, and if I can't answer you, I think I'll own it. Meantime, let's go inside."

II.

"I have an answer for you, Charlie boy," said Dr. Doone, amiably, the next morning, as they met on the veranda. "The reason that materialism seems so coarse and repulsive in your eyes is that you lose sight of human feeling. Suppose we are only jumbles of atoms in the eyes of Science. At least in our own hearts we

know that we are princes of creation and the wonder of the universe!"

"Oh, heavens!" said Edwards. "What dreadful inconsistency again! Get down to facts, my dear man, and what becomes of all your fine sentiments. What is a noble thought or a lofty ideal according to your dear materialism? Why, it's nothing in the world but a little bunch of atoms in the flabby organism we call a brain, happening to assume some certain form, which causes stimuli in the nerve centres, which gives you the amiable delusion that you have a feeling or a thought. But the true scientific materialist should not hear a word of such nonsense. To him it all comes back to a question of accidental arrangement of brute matter. Into this hideous crucible of confusion he throws all that is lovely and generous and true in life and man. It all boils down to a question—if I may put it crudely—if some microscopic wiggles in divers cells, or, as the layman might describe it, if the stumbling about of a tiny bit of meat in the skull. Heroism, virtue, nobility, character; unselfishness and generosity, courage and kindness—nay, even poetry and music, filial affection, the tenderness of lovers, the fidelity of friends; what are they all according to your horrid theory but a shifting of cells or an oozing of secretions? The noblest act of heroism and devotion that was ever said or sung should consistently seem no better or more admirable to you than the gushing forth of a drop of pepsin in a pig's stomach or the bumping along of red corpuscles through the vessels of a frog!"

"Well, what of it?" said Doone, somewhat testily; "we are beings of sentiment, too."

"My dear fellow, as I said, there is just the height of your happy inconsistency. With a theory which should destroy the last vestige of feeling, virtue and honor and make a man a swinish brute, a stout denier and despiser of everything noble and humane, you insist on keeping every convenient sentiment and virtue. Why, you are really living on the vitality and clothed with the seemliness and dignity of the very system you most affect to destroy and supplant—the noble system of Christianity.

"Where did you get the ideas you make much of—the dignity of man, the nobility of service, the sweet reasonableness of altruism? From the believers in an immortal soul, in a life beyond the animal. And when you have built up a theory which denies the very foundations and postulates of all these noble things, with a happy inconsistency, as I say, you calmly keep the fruit when you have blasted and undermined the very roots of the tree!"

"We have our theories, too—dozens of them," said Doone stoutly.

"I'm not much for that kind of thing myself, but if I had my library here I could show you copious explanations—books on books full of them!"

"Exactly, my dear fellow," answered Edwards; "you have many theories—choose any one you will—they all agree dismally in this, that they base noble structures on a rotten foundation. They start with the assumption that man is a mere congeries of matter and then build up moving descriptions of his vast preëminence from what they know of human dignity as it is. In other words, they assume human nature to be a degraded accident—which it is not—and then describe it as a very paragon of creation—which it is. They are right in saying that man is supremely noble, but wrong in ascribing that supreme nobility to a mere hodge-podge of nerves and blood."

"Theories or no theories," said Doone, half to himself, "man is a noble being. It certainly seems that the materialistic idea does fail to respect and account for his dignity and distinction," he continued. "But why, then, are so many materialists—and notably many members of our own great profession—such sincere admirers of mankind and earnest philanthropists, too?"

"Precisely, as I said before, because of their happy inconsistency. If they follow their theory, whither would it lead them? To the most sodden selfishness and contempt of the race and disregard of all human need and suffering. For if there is one quality of matter which is constant and invariable, it is its utter subjection to fixed and inevitable laws. Isn't that so?" Doone nodded, not very energetically, foreseeing another unpleasant conclusion.

"These fixed laws, then—chemical, physical, what you will, must govern all mere matter absolutely," continued Edwards, vigorously, "so that the actions and reactions of the most complex organisms are as necessary and inevitable, as utterly predetermined and completely mechanical, if I may so express it, as the falling of a stone ✓ or the sprouting of a seed. Isn't that so?" A reluctant nod again. "Why, then, it follows, don't you see," cried Edwards, gathering impetus, "that the brain and heart of man are no exception to this iron rule—that they, too, act along blind laws and are impelled to inevitable actions and reactions? And if this be so, what a mere empty name is 'philanthropy' and 'humanity' and how foolish it is for an avowed materialist to profess them. Your pity, your will to help and serve, your skilled investigation and assiduous care, are all mere delusions—blind motions of the brain, cell-vibrations, physical secretions—call them what you will, they are absolutely inevitable, perfectly fixed—no more under your control than the motion of the stars. How inconsistent, then, to try and be

philanthropic or helpful if one is a materialist; how foolish, indeed, to try and be anything; both you and the object of your endeavors are blank machines—neither the one nor the other able to do aught but yield to necessary and rigid laws and impulses. How vain, I say, to dream of trying to help any one! There is neither personality to try, nor will to desire, nor intellect to direct—for all these things are deceptions. Nothing is there, at the brain and heart of this seemingly noble humanity of ours, but blood and tissue and nerves, things utterly the play of material and necessary force and law.

"But we *know* we *have* personality, and will and intellect," broke in Doone. "Materialism doesn't deny the phenomena; it merely explains them along scientific lines. I know very well, for instance—I *feel* it, am conscious of it, so to speak—that I can do as I choose and that's surely volition. I know, too, that I can apprehend and measure truth—that's intelligence—and that I am *I* and no one else—that's personality. I admit that—I must admit it. But when I come to explain these things I find nothing in myself to account for them but brain and blood and nerves, physical and chemical forces. Therefore, these things must somehow produce thought and will and personality."

"A marvelous way of reasoning!" cried Edwards. "You notice in yourself spontaneous, free and self-governing powers—you admit their existence—you are forced to it by consciousness. On the other hand, science assures you most emphatically that it is of the very nature of all merely material action, to be fixed, necessary, inevitable. Will you then blindly insist on explaining these phenomena by laws which should produce their very opposite? Free actions produced by necessary laws! How very contradictory and absurd! And you cannot deny, as you have just owned, that you are a free, intelligent personality, because consciousness itself keeps forcing that conclusion on you. So—oh, happy inconsistency again!—you calmly act as a man, while in theory you profess that you are a mere machine!"

"Well, what is a man to do?" said Doone. "The facts are there; we are conscious of a free personality, but the scalpel and microscope find nothing to explain it, but nerve and brain and tissue, though these seem, as you say, quite inadequate to produce the effect. What can one do?"

"Do?" said Edwards. "Make your theory fit the facts instead of forcing the facts to fit your theory. Obviously you push your argument in the wrong direction. You make up your mind, first of all, that there is nothing but matter in the world, and then, of course, every phenomenon in the universe must be the result of blind material forces. But wouldn't it be more scientific to say:

'Here are phenomena—of conscious personality—free volition and so on, which are beyond and above the blind and necessary powers of matter? Therefore, they do *not* proceed from matter, but from something above and beyond!'

"Confound your logic!" said Doone, looking half-convinced.

"In fact," continued Edwards, "you seem to me to do the very thing for doing which you condemn the mediæval monks and schoolmen. They argued *a priori*, so do you. They sometimes followed an abstract principle or a preconceived idea to unwarranted conclusions—you do worse. For which is farther from the true scientific spirit to say, as some of them did, 'A sphere is the most perfect of forms, therefore the heavenly bodies are all spherical,' or as you do, 'Matter is all there is, therefore mind and volition and personality are all the products of blind material operations?'"

"It does all look pretty inconsistent as you put it, Charlie," said Doone, frowning meditatively, "but this way of thinking is strange to me. You'll have to give me time to work it out. I'll wager you now by to-morrow I'll have some argument or difficulty that will lay you cold."

"Bring it along," said Edwards, laughing; "if it's a new one, I'll vote you a learned degree!"

III.

"By Jove, Charlie," said Dr. Doone, as they met on the porch the following morning, "you have that controversial twinkle in your eye again."

"I'm just longing," said Edwards, smiling briskly, "for the promised argument that was to lay me cold." "Why, really, since you've gotten me on this subject," said the other, "my thinking's been all by sixes and sevens. The fact is, I had never philosophized much on these questions at all. The thing seemed so plain—that all there is to the Universe is matter of some sort or other—that I took it for granted, and I thought every really well-informed man in his heart of hearts must do the same. I own, as you put it, it's an inconsistent thing to hold that theory and yet keep our present feelings and traditions about the nobility of man and the excellence of Philanthropy. But I find I simply can't disentangle it—so there you are!"

"Honestly said!" cried Edwards. "Not many men would have the courage to be so frank. I wouldn't have been, I know, when I was in your state of mind. But do you know, Dr. Doone, I firmly believe that your experience is that of nine-tenths of professed atheists and materialists among the members of our profession? It isn't a question of reasoned conviction with them—it's half

example and half preoccupation. My own case was precisely the same. For a long time, if any one had put to me the objections I have given you, I should probably have made the same answers. I preferred indeed not to talk on such subjects at all, but if I was pushed to it, those were my views. Looking back, I think I can see the precise causes of that mental attitude. The first, and perhaps the strongest, was precisely as you say, that other men, whom I considered wiser than I, held to materialism; the next, that there seemed to be so many difficulties in accepting any other theory; and, finally, there was the intense and continual preoccupation with more urgent and tangible concerns, which made me averse to any theorizing whatever out of medical lines. Did I ever tell you how I came to change my views?"

"No," said Doone, "and I should very much like to hear."

"It was when my daughter Laura died," said Edwards, reminiscently. "I little thought so heavy a grief would bring me so great a good. She was at the flower of her youth—just turned eighteen, and the darling of my heart. Her death came suddenly of cardiac rheumatism and it broke me utterly for a time. And as I stood over her dead body, fresh and lovely as in life, I suddenly thought with horror that according to the materialistic idea this was all there had ever been to that beloved child—a body of flesh and bone, a mass of fibre and nerve—that it needed only a little motion there for my own Laura to open her eyes and speak to me tenderly as of old. My whole being revolted at the thought. 'There is something more in death,' said I to myself, 'than the mere stopping of a machine. Life is more than mere motion, else what had my living Laura been but a meaningless puppet—a galvanized corpse!' I shuddered and turned away. Then I felt my wife's soft touch on my arm. 'Charlie,' said she, tearfully, 'at least here you will not refuse to think that there is a soul.' She, dear woman, had been trying in vain in every way for twenty years to move me from my unbelief—but she succeeded then. I fell on my knees beside that hallowed bier, and unfamiliar prayers came to my lips again, and since that day," he concluded, looking towards his friend, "I have frankly hated the very name of materialism!"

"I see, I see," said Doone, hesitatingly. "Yet to be honest with you, I cannot go so far. There are difficulties in materialism—so are there in most systems—but I still maintain they are not so great nor so glaring as you think. I am not ready for a change of view. I should have to readjust all my theories of life."

"Precisely!" cried Edwards. "I sympathize very deeply with your attitude of mind, but let us go on. I believe if you are once convinced you will make the readjustment."

"I suppose so," said Doone, uncomfortably, and half to himself; "but I am not specially eager for the event."

"We have seen, I think," said Edwards, "that Materialism quite destroys the dignity of man, makes philanthropy, honor, righteousness—in a word, all that is laudable or estimable in human nature, a mere affair of brain and nerves, or to go farther still, a blind, mechanical and inevitable working out of necessary laws of matter. How dreadful and deadening this principle would be if carried logically into all our human activities one shudders to think. But materialists never push the principle so far. With happy inconsistency——" Doone threw up his hands. "You can supply the rest," said Edwards, smiling. "They act as though they were really personal beings endowed with will and mind. But there is another province of human activity in which this same inconsistency appears most opportunely. Morals, my dear fellow—morals, what would they be if you followed your system to the end?"

"Why," said Doone, "pretty much as they are now, I imagine. We materialists are not such a wicked lot."

"You can hardly be wicked," answered Edwards, "according to your own principles. Resolve the worst possible act into its ultimate terms in the materialistic view and what does it become? An affair of nerve and brain action at most—the excitation of a few irresponsible cells—as harmless and little worthy of censure as the grinding of the digestive organs. Do you hold criminals worthy of blame?" "Why, of—of course, at least in a way," said Doone. "Why should you now—aren't they mere mechanical organisms? Can they help it that their cells go wrong?"

"Why," said Doone, "hardly; but we couldn't run society on any such idea as that you know."

"So you excuse them theoretically and hang them practically—again a very convenient and happy inconsistency. Because to hold them really responsible would undoubtedly ruin your theory, whereas to let them go scot-free would ruin the community at large!"

"You put it rather baldly, I should say," said Doone, a little warmly. "It's very true that the old ideas of moral responsibility and all that have been knocked all askew by deterministic materialism; but we have something better in their place. We have the ethics of evolution to steer by now. The criminal is a degenerate type, a reversal from the onward movement of human evolution toward the ideal. Where we find him putting himself into conflict with the upward trend of the race we seize him and constrain him to move out of the path of progress. If extreme measures are necessary, we put him out of existence. It is all on precisely the

same principle, just as sane, sensible and practical as that on which a gardener plucks up weeds when they threaten to choke his flowers, or better still, on which you would excise a man's appendix when it is misbehaving and threatening to destroy his life."

"My dear fellow," said Edwards, "will you answer me some straightforward questions?"

"Ask away," said Doone with an air of resignation.

"First of all," began Edwards, "do you believe in the conservation of energy and in all that term implies?"

"Of course," answered the other, staring a little.

"Then, what is to be the end at last of all this great cosmic evolution on which you base your newly-furbished ethics?"

"The end? Why, a glorious race of beings—Man at his utmost beauty and perfection of body and of intellect—a sort of earthly heaven, better than the one of which you vitalists dream."

"Stop a bit!" cried Edwards. "I thought you just declared your firm adhesion to the principle of the conservation of energy?"

"Well, what if I did," answered Doone, a little testily. "What in the world has the conservation of energy to do with the apotheosis of man or the goal of evolution?"

"What has it to do with them? Everything," answered Edwards. "Once admit the conservation of energy and one comes to the inevitable and exhilarating conclusion that the goal of organic evolution, and of everything else in the universe, for that matter—sun, moon, stars and planets—is a final condition of uniform rot—dry rot and utter extinction—nothing more! And you and I and all men, past and present, even your future paragons, are only stages by the way."

"Oh, come now," cried Doone; "how do you make that out?"

"It's as simple as two-plus two," answered Edwards gayly. "The available energy of the universe is limited. You grant that, I think?" Doone nodded. "It is spending itself quite rapidly," continued Edwards; "that goes without saying. So in some fixed period of time—how long or how short doesn't make much difference to Science—the dance of change will all be over. The available energy of the universe will have been exhausted—a dead level of permanent rest will have been achieved. Behold the goal of evolution. This final and stable permanence, as I pointed out to you in our last talk, not any possible incidental perfection of the chance bundle of reactions and complexities called man, which this evolution tosses up and destroys by the way, is the goal and term of all this evolving, flux and change."

"Well, what then?" said Doone, wrinkling his forehead. "How

does that alter our right on evolutionary grounds to do away with criminals?"

"Only in this far," answered Edwards, pointing an expository finger: "It shows that man is *not* the goal of evolution, but only an incident by the way. Now, you based the right of Society to destroy the criminal on the fact that he was hindrance to the onward march of evolution towards its final goal. I answer, how? The final goal of Evolution is a permanent rest and exhaustion of all natural energies—a sort of physical nirvana of the universe, if one can speak so. How does the criminal hinder that?"

"But he *does* hinder the evolution of human society and of the individual man," said Doone, "so away with him."

"Excuse me for reminding you once more, John, that we are all of us mere incidental complexities, thrown out in the general march of all things towards simplicity and extinction. Why should your peculiar type of fortuitous complexity say to the criminal's type, 'I am to be preferred to you?' You must establish first some superiority over him."

"But it stands to reason," said Doone, looking dazed, "that the criminal is an obstacle to civilization. You wouldn't deny that, surely?"

"It certainly doesn't stand to materialistic reason, John," answered Edwards. "For on what grounds do you damn him? Hasn't he a right to dance out his little day and spend his little handful of vital energy as he chooses as well as you? Isn't he hastening on towards the final crash and extinction as quickly as any one? Isn't he promoting the swift transition to another stage as fast as he can? And what matter is it what this or that fortuity does by the way, whether his way or yours prevails for a little time? The cosmic wheel keeps rolling, the cosmic pot keeps boiling, everything bubbles and simmers merrily along towards the final twilight and extinction which, according to mere materialistic notions, must be at last the end and bourne of all."

"But how do you know that the universe is to remain in that dead level of exhausted energy?" Doone remonstrated. "Why not suppose some new accession of energy—some explosion of hidden and dormant forces—some reenergizing of the cosmic system which may rejuvenate the universe again and set the great, majestic processes of vital evolution ringing once more down the long grooves of change?"

"What then?" cried Edwards. "That only strengthens our argument. If this whole order of things is but an incident in a long chain of disconnected epochs—regalvanizations of the cosmic structure, then in very truth what a trifling incident is man. How

much more absurd to build up a system of ethics on his worth and dignity. How much more inconsistent to dignify and exalt this bubble in the cosmic whirlpool, this gleam on the troubled waters of the seething streams of change!"

Dr. Doone swallowed once or twice and gazed reflectively at the end of his cigar.

"So much for the criminal," continued Dr. Edwards, after some meditative puffs. "But now for the crime. Are any actions really wrong, according to you materialists?"

"Of course!" cried Doone. "Why not?"

"Why not? Why so?" pursued his friend. "Doesn't it all come down after all to a question of chemical and physical actions and reactions? And can there be anything wicked in those?"

"I don't quite catch your point," said Doone doggedly.

"You promise not to get angry now," said Edwards. "Well, then, let's go more into particulars. Now answer me this, for instance—is murder wrong?"

"Wrong? Abominable! What a question! Do you take us for savages?" said Doone, rather hotly.

"Well, now, why should it be?" persisted Edwards earnestly. "Analyze the thing dispassionately in the mere light of your theory. Suppose even that a man should murder his own mother in cold blood—faugh!—the very words stick in my throat!—what would that be, from the materialistic standpoint, but the mere destruction or changing of a chemical and physical compound? Now I challenge your honesty. Answer me strictly along the lines of materialistic theory."

Doone swallowed and coughed. "Why—er—well—er," said he, "but—it would be destroying a very valuable chemical compound!"

Edwards laughed long and loud. "And that's all?" he cried. "Yes, that's all. That's honestly the most that a materialist could say to justify his condemnation of matricide. I spare you further applications. There is no human feeling, however sacred and holy, which one must not consistently abandon if he follows the logic of materialism. The most horrid comparisons are perfectly inevitable and clear. No man could bear to think of, much less to utter, all the dread consequences of these dreary premises. It would be far too painful to our nobler sentiments and conviction to pursue such a line of thought to its unsavory end. And you, a sensible man, and thousands on thousands of other sensible men, hold by such a theory?"

"Now look here, Charlie," said Dr. Doone, straightening up in his chair and looking very much puzzled, "I—I don't believe I'm

much of a materialist as you understand it, after all. I'm an agnostic—a terrible agnostic—that's what I am."

"Do you abandon Materialism, John," said Edwards, "because my 'thirst for controversy,' as you call it, will not be slaked with less?"

"I don't know," said Doone. "All I can say is, I see no answer to your questions and puzzles. Wiser men than I hold to materialism; let them answer you. I'm sure they could."

"My dear fellow," said Edwards, "don't you know in your heart of hearts that the wisest and keenest of them all could do little better than you have done in answering objections like these? They are simply driven to be inconsistent, that is all. If they hold to the theory that everything is matter, they may wriggle and squirm as they choose; they must finally swallow a hundred contradictions, of which I've only hinted at a little part."

"Mysteries, you mean," said Doone. "We can't understand everything."

"No; contradictions, flat, glaring, hideous contradictions. Mysteries are things we can't understand, though we can see they do not involve any inconsistency; but the contradictions of materialism are open and horrid. Imagine one's saying that everything is mere brute matter, moved by necessary laws, and then thinking or maintaining any one or anything to be exalted, virtuous or noble! Virtue and crime, as we were saying before, nobility and villainy, intellect and idiocy, design and confusion, murder and philanthropy should merge into one silly, purposeless dance of dead atoms in brain and nerve. Admit materialism and you should own at once that you are as incapable of anything intelligent, voluntary or human as a beast in the jungle, as a vegetable, as a handful of waterwashed sand!"

There was a lengthy pause while both men followed in silence the current of their thoughts.

"Well, suppose a man does give up the confounded theory," said Doone, at last, "what then? What do you offer in its place? Give me your system, your ideas, and let me see if they are any freer than mine from what you call 'these happy inconsistencies.'"

"I will, John; I will," said Edwards, earnestly, looking at his friend with a new light in his glance, "but not now. Enough for this morning. Let us go inside."

EDWARD F. GARESCHE, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

INFLUENCE OF GAELIC LITERATURE ON THE IRISH AND ON THE WORLD.

THE influence of Gaelic literature was necessarily twofold in its nature. It moulded—and still moulds—the Irish character, and it shaped and embellished the literature of the world to a far greater extent than is generally conceded.

All real literature springs from the very heart of a people. It is a criterion of the degree of civilization they have attained. It embodies their ideals, their gropings after truth, their hope of an abode of future blessedness, be that abode called Walhalla, or the Happy Hunting Ground, or Moy Mell or Heaven. In its turn it reacts upon those who produced or cherish it, safeguarding those ideals lest, blinded, weakened or disheartened by care and sorrow, or enervated and brutalized by the fairness of time's lilies which "are to-day and to-morrow are cast in the oven," they lose sight of the better world toward which each and all are journeying.

Perhaps no race has had greater need of literature than have the Irish. Naturally high-minded, in love with the good and the beautiful, they have what the French call the defects of their qualities. They are impetuous, impressionable and pleasure-loving, and, undirected, their love of beauty might have degenerated into the pantheistic nature worship which vitiates so much of modern poetry and modern philosophy, or their delicacy of sentiment, crushed beneath the weight of centuries of warfare, followed by centuries of poverty and oppression, might have stiffened into a dull, unimaginative hardness, unsusceptible to the influence of every sentiment unconnected with their own misery. That they have rushed into neither extreme is due primarily to their faith; but that faith owes much to a literature which in its infancy was given into St. Patrick's keeping and became, under his influence, so truly beautiful that, in the words of an old author, the angels of God leaned over the edge of heaven to hear the songs of the Irish bards. That faith owes much to a literature which, its childhood outgrown, waxed strong in the days when Ireland was known the world over as the "Isle of Saints and Scholars."

Fairy tales have furnished the lively imaginations of the Irish with the food they craved; stories once sung by the bards and now repeated about every fireside have kept before them examples of heroic bravery and heroic sanctity; their poems, of a delicacy of sentiment and musical beauty seldom equaled, have helped them rise above the sordidness of their surroundings; the family annals, preserved with loving accuracy, century after century, have con-

stantly reminded them that their ancestors suffered much for faith and country and have sustained their courage for the world over *noblesse oblige*.

Since the days of St. Patrick the Irish have written much and written well. They have studied Holy Scripture, the Fathers of the Church and the pagan classics, as well as their own literature, not wresting these things to their own destruction, but making true knowledge a stepping stone to heaven. The consequence of all this is that the poisonous breath of rationalism which pollutes modern thought spreads no contagion in Ireland. Healthy minds like healthy bodies are immune to disease.

Nor has the influence of Gaelic literature been confined to the island which gave it birth. From the beginning the Irish were wanderers and they carried their literature with them. It was a factor in the intellectual development of many nations. It gave of the music, the joyousness, the humor, the tenderness which characterized it, thereby broadening and sweetening and elevating the whole range of mediæval and modern thought. Though it cannot boast of having produced any world masterpiece, it contributed to more than one and that in divers ways.

It was a poem on Hell written by Brenda, an Irishman, which probably suggested to Dante the outline of his *Inferno*. Greater glory still—rhyme originated in the alliteration invented by the Gaelic bards. They began with vowel assonance, which in time they completed by the addition of consonantal assonance, and so rhyme was evolved. The first fully rhymed hymns and poems were carried to the Continent by Gaelic missionaries after the invasions of the barbarians had overthrown the already disintegrated Roman Empire and with it the culture of the pagan world, and when the beautiful poetry of Greece and Rome was wrapped in a deathlike slumber awaiting the coming of the Prince in the guise of the Renaissance. In the meantime rhyme was adopted by Europe, never to be disinherited.

Rhyme is the only feature of literature which did not come to us from the East. The specimens we have of the first poetry of Oriental nations, other than the Hebrew, are fine examples of the possibilities of rhythm and the beginnings of meter. As poetry journeyed westward meter became as important as rhythm, and these two beauties differentiated it from prose.

The possibilities of rhyme, that gift of ancient Ireland to the world, are nowhere so strikingly illustrated as in the hymns written in Latin during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and incorporated into the majestic liturgy of the Church. Take, for example, that most perfect of them all, the *Dies Irae*. Professor Saintsbury

calls it "the greatest of all hymns and one of the greatest of all poems." Written by a Franciscan monk, Thomas of Celano, from purely religious motives, as a model of style it has never been equaled. Saintsbury maintains further that, "After the *Dies Irae* no poet could say that any effect of poetry was, as far as sound goes, unattainable, though few could hope to equal it, and perhaps no one except Dante and Shakespeare had ever fully done so."

And in modern times rhyme has found favor with writers of every nationality. Milton alone, of the great poets, has condemned it, possibly because no friend of Cromwell's would approve of anything of Irish origin. He called it "the invention of a barbarous age to set of wretched matter and lame meter." Nevertheless, he used it with brilliant effect in his Hymn to the Nativity.

One of the marked characteristics of Gaelic writers is the facility with which they express sentiment. Tenderness of feeling is common to a greater or less degree to all mankind, but many people stammer when they try to express it, others instinctively conceal it. No nation ever possessed this aptitude to as great a degree as the Irish, and it was from them that all others learned what they have of this power. But for Gaelic influence Dante might never have voiced in the *Vita Nuova* the story of his youthful love, and Walther Von der Vogelweide's exquisite love lyrics had been sung on a lower key. But for it the Sonnets from the Portuguese had frozen in a woman's heart and brain.

In a fine and oft quoted passage Henry Morley boldly develops this or a very similar idea. "The main current of English literature," he says, "cannot be disconnected from the lively Celtic wit in which it has one of its sources. The Celts do not form an entirely distinct part of our mixed population. But for an early, frequent and various contact with the race that in its half-barbarous days invented Ossin's dialogues with St. Patrick and that quickened the Northmen's blood in France, Germanic England would not have produced a Shakespeare."

Their schools furnished the Gaels with a vast field of influence. Beginning with the day of St. Patrick and continuing for several hundred years, the schools flourishing in the shadow of the Irish cloisters were the most famous in the world. As Newman said, "The Celt preceded the Anglo-Saxon, not only in Christianity, but in his cultivation and custody of learning, religious and secular, and again in his zeal for its propagation." And Dollinger asserts that in the sixth and seventh centuries "whilst almost the whole of Europe was devastated by war, peaceful Ireland, far from the invasions of foreign foes, opened to lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum" in her cloister schools. It is inconceivable

that the students who flocked to Ireland learned there only their religion and the Greek and Latin classics. The very air they breathed was charged with fairy lore and hero tales and poems. They must have carried back to their more prosaic homes in Britain, Gaul and Germany a blessed touch of the kind of poetry indigenous to Irish soil.

Nor were the numerous monasteries of Ireland content with being centres of learning and piety in their mother country. They scattered missionaries to all parts of the then known world, missionaries whose first and last object was the spread of the Gospel, but who used learning, religious and secular, as a powerful means to their end. With the Irish learning and piety ever went hand in hand. It was not long before Continental Europe was dotted with their foundations, the most famous being St. Gall, in Switzerland; Fulda, in Germany, and Bobbio, in Italy. The work of Marianus Scotus will furnish an example of their activity. Born in Ireland in 1028, he traveled to Germany, where he taught mathematics at Ratisbonne, and finally became a monk. He wrote a history of the world from the Creation to the year 1083, following Cassiodorus, Eusebius and Bede, but with the use of such excellent copies of these authors that his work now serves for frequent correction of their text.

Within the last century the value of the learned labors of the Irish on the Continent was brought to light by the researches of the scholarly De Rossi. In their own country the Gaels had ever written and carefully preserved family records and epitaphs. They carried this custom eastward with them. De Rossi, straining after every gleam of light from a distant past, found that vast numbers of early Christian inscriptions and epitaphs had been destroyed, but not before they had been faithfully copied by the monks of Bobbio, by Sedulius Scotus and other Gaels who alone appreciated their value at a time when ignorance had settled over Italy, France and Germany. Fortunately, much of their work escaped destruction, and from it De Rossi was able to gather and to give to the world (in his "*Inscriptiones Christianæ*") a wealth of information concerning the customs and history of the first Christians.

A curious—and very characteristic—instance of the ancient Gael's influence over the literary destiny of other peoples is related in connection with Taliesin, the most famous of the old Welsh bards, who flourished about the middle of the sixth century, whose poetry was revived in the twelfth and whose name is still revered by his countrymen. His poems celebrate the warlike deeds of Urien, whom tradition makes a nephew of King Arthur's. It seems that

when a youth Taliesin was seized by Irish pirates—for even in that day *all* the Irish did not spend *all* their time in study and deeds of piety. In an improvised boat Taliesin escaped from his captors and made his way to Welsh soil at a spot where one of Urien's sons was fishing. He was taken to Urien's court—and so, with the help of the Gaels, his poetry had found its theme.

In conclusion: While influence is ever an intangible thing, often difficult to trace, it is beyond question, first, that the literature of the Gael exercised unbounded influence at the height of its glory in the sixth and seventh centuries, an influence strongly felt throughout the Middle Ages and not yet dead; and, second, that this influence has ever been potent for good. Its tendency is beautifully typified by the Irish Duns Scotus, who proclaimed, and to a certain degree popularized, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception when St. Bernard and St. Thomas did not admit it and long ages before it was infallibly defined by the Church. Little wonder that to-day loyal and far-sighted Irishmen are striving to revive for their countrymen the language and literature of their glorious past!

F. GILMORE.

Columbus, Ohio.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XIII: Revel—Simon. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

The appearance of Volume XIII. so early in the year is a concrete guarantee that the work will be completed well within the promised time and that what seemed almost an impossible task a few years ago will become an accomplished triumph. Already the additional volume, containing index, corrections and additions, is well under way, and that will crown the work. The editors have asked that their attention be called to mistakes of commission or omission, and they hope to make their work still more perfect by correcting these.

Among the important articles in this volume attention might be called to "Revelation," G. H. Joyce, S. J.; "Rites," a collection of articles covering twenty-two pages; "Roman," a series covering thirty-six pages; "Rome," U. Benigni, fourteen pages; "Sacrifice," J. Pohle, eleven pages; "Schism," twelve pages, and "The Seal of Confession," fifteen pages. Among controversial subjects, "St. Bartholomew's Day," "Savonarola" and "Science and the Church" stand out prominently. Perhaps one should look for the first of this group more naturally under B.

Biography and history are as noticeably strong as usual, and under the latter head we call attention again to the history of dioceses which cannot be gotten anywhere else.

As the book draws to a close attention should be called to the work of Dr. Henry, of St. Charles' Seminary, Overbrook, on the "Hymns of the Breviary." He has been teaching this subject from the beginning in a scholarly manner which is attractive as well as instructive. Looking back one can understand the important part which he is playing in the making of the Encyclopedia, and how well equipped he is in this field, which he has tilled for years with great industry, and which has been to him a labor of love. It becomes more apparent every day that there is only one answer for the person who is seeking correct knowledge about the Catholic Church—get the Catholic Encyclopedia.

THE CULTURE OF THE SOUL. By the *Rev. P. Ryan*, author of "Catholic Doctrines Explained and Proved" and the "Groundwork of Christian Perfection." 12mo., pp. 226. New York Benziger Brothers.

The object the writer has in view in publishing this work is to help persons in the world to acquire Perfection.

The subjects of the present little volume are selected because

of their importance and because of their suitability to persons in every state and condition of life.

While using every effort to make each treatise brief and plain, the author has, at the same time, striven to have his work as complete as possible and to omit nothing which is necessary or useful.

It may strike many that this little book is simplicity itself, and so it is, but the writer has given it years of thought and has so condensed and arranged the matter that while it embraces all that he considers of utility, it is not too diffuse.

From this declaration of the author we learn that it was not his intention to produce a complete work on spirituality, with all the divisions and sub-divisions peculiar to it, but to make a practical guide which could be used by every one seeking that union with God in time and eternity which is the end of the spiritual life. He has succeeded admirably. The book has a simplicity and unction about it that are rare and effective. It draws rather than repels. It makes spiritual subjects pleasant and attractive, and it should do great good.

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO AND YEAR BOOK, 1912. Edited by Sir F. C. Burnand. London: Burns & Oates.

The impartial reviewer may say without fear of being accused of partiality that this is the best book of its kind. In size, in comprehensiveness, in clearness, in conciseness, in style, in type and in paper it is a model. The wonder is that so much can be gotten into such small space without the sacrifice of any of those qualities which we have a right to expect. Generally such books tell us too much or too little. They are made up of tiresome or useless details furnished by interested but uninteresting subjects or of dry facts so tersely put in puzzling abbreviations as to compel the reader to hold a key in his hand all the time. This book tells us about persons worth knowing, the things we want to know, and it makes the knowledge easy of acquirement.

A new feature this year are the illustrations, beginning naturally with His Eminence Cardinal Bourne and including distinguished men and women, lay and ecclesiastical.

HISTOIRE DE L'INQUISITION EN FRANCE. LA PROCEDURE INQUISITORIALE. Par T. de Cauzons. 1 vol. in 8. Prix: 7 fr. Bloud et Cie, éditeurs, 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

M. de Cauzons devoted the first volume of his great "Histoire de l'Inquisition en France" to the "Origins" of this ecclesiastical tribunal. In the present he studies its "Procedure." The same

learning, the same care for impartiality, the same moderation in judgment which made the first volume so successful are to be found in the second.

We trust that M. de Cauzon will soon reach the end of his task, thereby giving us a most complete and precise work on one of the most delicate subjects of controversy.

Although the author disclaims any intention of giving forth his conclusions as final, his work will, we hope, contradict many fables, dissipate many prejudices and, above all, put an end to the gross error which pictures all priests as bloodthirsty and all religious as torturers gloating over the agonies of their victims.

Criminal judges, the Inquisitors felt themselves, as all judges do at times, often torn between the sense of duty to execute the law and their desire to show pity; this latter they did to the utmost possibility.

STUDIES. An Irish Quarterly Review of Letters, Philosophy and Science. Published in March, June, September and December, under the editorial direction of a committee whose chairman is Rev. T. A. Finlay, S. J., Professor of Political Economy in University College, Dublin. For America, 75 cents a number; \$3.00 a year. Vol. I., No. 1, 8vo., pp. 220. Dublin: Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We welcome most heartily this new quarterly, which has every prospect of success, because the field is broad, the harvest is abundant and ripe and the reapers are skillful and zealous.

"The hitherto unsettled condition of university education and of higher studies in Ireland have been greatly altered for the better by recent measures. The work of organizing our university system has recently attained definite development." Hence the "Review."

The first number is very interesting and gives fair promise of better things to come. We hope that it will receive a royal welcome.

LA VIE MEILLEURE PAR LA PRIERE. Par le P. Badet. I vol. in 16. Prix: 3 fr. 50. Bloud et Cie, éditeurs, 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris (VI.).

Life without prayer will never be happy, because it is a life without God. Where God is lacking, nothing can replace Him. To introduce prayer as an essential element in the human life, ordinarily so dull, so earthly, so painful and often so guilty, is to make life better in every way. Such is the essential idea shining forth in these pages. The numerous hearers of P. Badet will find the echo of his words warmly persuasive.

Family prayer, the child's prayer, that of the rich as of the poor, prayer in all its aspects, is considered in this volume deeply and yet easily to be understood, exact in doctrine and furnishing matter for meditation rich in fruits of edification and good resolutions.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII.—JULY, 1912—No. 147.

THE PAPAL SWISS GUARDS.

THE victory of Lepanto had driven back the Mussulman to his own dreamy and enervating home in the far flung Orient. Europe had nothing to fear, for the present at least, from the swarthy followers of the camel-driver of Mecca. This contest with the Moslem had brought about what years of preaching and endeavor on the part of the Church had been unable to effect. For it is literally true to say that not since the age of the Crusades had the Catholic States of Europe stood nearer to one another in a spirit of genuine Christian solidarity. Only a really great danger of absorption by another and unknown milieu could have induced the countries of Europe to lay aside their ancient domestic quarrels in order to join hands against a civilization which was permeated throughout with the most deadly hatred of the culture that was born of the Gospel. War, it is true, broke out again among Christian nations after the battle of Lepanto; but it was not, for many a year to come, a chronic state, a normal condition, nor ever again so bloodthirsty and useless as in the days which preceded the sea fight by the Cape of Actium. Europe was exhausted by this one colossal effort—or at least tired of warring. Besides, it could not with good grace take up arms against the one man who had foreseen the danger to the Western world, and forgetting all unjust treatment he had suffered in the past, had called upon the Christian powers to repel the onward march of the foe. Furthermore, Italy was now pacified, since all that was worth fighting for had been carried off by the nations or left in a state of utter prostration by the passing of their armies. And, lastly, the countries of Europe

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

had political interests of their own nearer home which caused them much concern and engaged most of their time. There was no need to go a hunting for war. Men were beginning to learn other trades and professions than those of sharpening sabres and pillaging cities. And thus it came about that for the coming two hundred years the Pope of Rome became more and more the Prince of Peace. He spent his days beneficently in the Eternal City caring for the concerns of his own little kingdom which lay about him like a wheat field which had been trampled down by the feet of the unbidden strangers who had now—thank God!—withdrawn. A dawn of political peace for the Papal kingdom seemed at last to have broken! For Europe no longer sought to quarrel with Rome, because Rome did not go out of its own geographical boundaries to play a political rôle. It did the far better work of repairing the ruin and abolishing the disorders and alleviating the poverty which centuries of warfare had made almost indigenous to the fair soil of the Patrimony of St. Peter. The Pope's voice no longer rang loud and clear above the diplomatic chatter of politicians in the council chambers of the world, for in stopping their ears against his words of infallible teaching, the nations of Northern Europe also dispensed, gladly, with his counsels of an earthly import.

Switzerland had been imitating the headlong self-sufficingness of the Protestant countries by breaking with Rome. Since many a year an estrangement of affection, which the Popes had done their best to heal, petrified the loyalty of all the Swiss cantons, save seven, towards the Father of Christendom. But Rome never gave up her affection for the friend of long ago. A delegate was appointed to attend to all affairs of an ecclesiastical and political kind which might come up for treatment in Switzerland. This representative of the Holy See was charged to drive up volunteers for the Swiss Papal Guards, which were always deemed necessary to keep order in the Vatican, and to ward off the occasional riots which act as safety valves to a certain contingent of the Roman people. The line of colonel captains was never broken during the two hundred years of peace which now follow in the history of the Papacy. Every one of the heads of the Papal Guards deserves a brief mention.

Stephen Segesser de Baldegg was military instructor of the Guards in 1570, lieutenant in 1582 and succeeded his father as colonel captain in 1593. He retained this charge until his death in 1629.

Nicholas Fleckenstein, of Lucern, was ensign in 1582, lieutenant in 1593 and elected head of the Guards in 1629. He died March 10, 1640.

Jost Fleckenstein succeeded him in this capacity, but having been elected Bailiff of the Republic of Lucern, he obtained leave of absence from Urban VIII. On the expiration of his term of office as Bailiff in 1643 he hastened to Rome to take up his duties as head of the company, and died on June 26, 1652.

John Rudolf Pfyffer, grandson of the famous Louis Pfyffer, of Altishofen, was chosen as successor and died December 5, 1657. The Chapter of St. Peter at this time conceded the Church of St. Pellegrin in perpetuity to the Guards for their exclusive use. The adjoining cemetery was also set aside as the last resting place of all Guards who died in Rome. It was so used until 1870.

Louis Pfyffer, brother of the preceding and victorious leader at the battle of Vilmergen, was captain from 1657 until his death on June 13, 1686. During his term of command Rome was disturbed by factions which sympathized with the French and the Spanish crowns. A corps of Corsican soldiers in the employ of the Holy See unfortunately insulted the French Ambassador, Créqui, in 1661. France at once revenged its honor by annexing Venaissin. The Pope tried to raise a troop of sixteen hundred Swiss dragoons in 1663, but only succeeded in obtaining from the cantons of Lucern and Zoug two companies of two hundred soldiers each. The former was placed under the command of Joseph Amrhyn, the latter under Caspar de Brandenburg. When, in 1667, the relations between Rome and France became more cordial on account of the advent of Clement IX. to the Pontifical throne, Amrhyn was replaced by Placid Meyer, who was a friend of the French. This company was no longer lodged in the Vatican, but at San Salvador, in Lauro, and later on at Spoleto. Meyer, who was an excellent engineer, was charged with the construction of fortifications at Civita-Vecchia. But he also found time to hatch a plot for the supplanting of Pfyffer, who was on a furlough in Switzerland, as colonel captain of the Swiss Papal Guards. But the attempt to dislodge Pfyffer miscarried. Meyer was retained in service as military engineer. His troop of soldiers, which had dwindled to one hundred men in 1667, was disbanded in 1672. Pfyffer's company was thereupon reorganized and the number of soldiers placed at two hundred. Clement IX. organized a special Guard of Papal Swiss soldiers to attend Queen Christina of Sweden. This princess had abdicated in 1654, embraced the Catholic faith at Innsbruck in 1665 and fixed her residence in Rome, where she lived a life of great piety and charity, dying in 1689. On her death this Guard was dissolved.

Francis Pfyffer, of Altishofen, lieutenant in 1670, was elected colonel in 1676. During the reign of Pope Alexander VIII., who died in 1691, he was more than once called upon to defend the

judiciary autonomy of the company. By his calmness and firmness he succeeded in maintaining the rights which the Popes had granted the Guards. He died on March 13, 1696.

John Caspar Meyer de Baldegg was acting in the capacity of lieutenant of the company when he was commissioned by Innocent XI. to gather an army of two thousand four hundred Swiss soldiers for the service of Charles II., King of Spain. Although absent from Rome in 1696, Pope Innocent XI. conferred on him the charge of colonel captain in recognition of his distinguished services. Shortly after the treaty of peace of Ryswick, when his army was reformed and reorganized, Meyer took possession of his command at Rome. He died here in 1705 and was not replaced until 1712. During the interim the command was exercised by the lieutenant of the Guards, John Conrad Pfyffer, of Altishofen, who had acted in the same capacity during the absence of John Caspar Meyer.

John Conrad Pfyffer was finally elected colonel captain in 1712 and died at Rome on July 21, 1727.

Francis Louis Pfyffer, of Altishofen, who had been accepted as a professed Knight of Malta in 1717, and acted as under-lieutenant of the Papal Guards in 1720, was elected to the command of the Guards in 1727. He resigned the post on March 10, 1754. On June 24 of the same year he was elected conventual prefect and member of the council of the Order of Malta, filling these charges with universal satisfaction for fifteen years. On March 20, 1759, he was elected Mayor of Brandenburg, notwithstanding the intrigues of the German chapter of Heidesheim. Clement VIII. confirmed the choice on March 2, 1763. Pfyffer died at Malta on June 7, 1771. During the command of Conrad Pfyffer Innocent XIII. enlarged the barracks of the Swiss Guards on the Quirinal. Clement XII. later on demolished these to give way to a large annex of the Papal Palace, in which the Guards, together with suitable quarters for its officers, were lodged. Victor Emmanuel died in this annex in 1878, finding it uncomfortable, in his last moments, to dwell in the former apartments of the Holy Father.

Joseph Ignatius Pfyffer, of Altishofen, cousin of Francis Louis Pfyffer, was elected to the headship of the Guards in 1754 and died at Rome in 1792, just as Europe was beginning to feel the first shocks of the French Revolution.

During these two hundred years of peace the Catholic cantons of Switzerland never failed to supply the soldiers of whom the Pope stood in need. They were ever to be found in close proximity to the Father of Christendom, being lodged with him in the Quirinal Palace during the winter months and in the palace on Monte-Cavallo during the summer season. Every month a detachment of

Guards, nineteen in number, took the way to Pesaro in order to assure protection to the Governor there. In times of uprising it was the duty of the Papal Swiss Guards to guard the Papal fortresses. This corps of soldiers enjoyed the inviolable right of precedence over all other Pontifical troops. In times of peace the one charge which the Guard was bound to accept was to be in attendance upon the Pope. It assisted in body at the burials of Cardinals and other high officials of the Church. It was at the disposition of the Papal master of ceremonies for all extraordinary occasions, such as the consecration of Bishops, councils, reception of kings and the like. The Swiss Guards were recruited from amongst the best Catholic families in Switzerland. Hence we scarcely ever find amongst them any moral disorders to complain of, and we shall see, in the revolutionary days to follow, that they remained faithful to their oaths of fealty to the Pope. Many of these strong warriors were models of Christian piety. Thus we find that it was not an uncommon thing for the Swiss Guards on furlough to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Nicholas Reymann, of Einsiedeln, and John Joseph Ackermann, of Lucern, published an account of their pilgrimage to the sacred places of Palestine in 1702. Others devoted their leisure hours to the cultivation of the arts. John Gross, of Lucern, won an enviable name for his engravings in 1641, entitled "*Splendore della antica et moderna Roma.*" Those who distinguished themselves in painting are James Bodmer, of Rothenburg; Hunkeler, of Altishofen; Peter Herzog, of Munster; Ignatius Pfyffer and Jost Schiffmann, of Lucern, and also Bolzern and Zimmermann, of the same canton.

These two hundred years of peace—a peaceful and undisturbed siesta in an historical career torn from without and swept from within by storms of all kinds—came to an end with the accession of Cardinal John Braschi to the Pontifical throne in October, 1774. Pius VI., as the new Pope chose to be known, was often forced by the sad vicissitudes of his reign to deal with the Papal Guards and depend upon their loyalty and courage for his bodily safety. In 1792 he appointed Francis Louis Pfyffer, of Altishofen, to the post of colonel captain, as we have already seen. Four years later the French army of Napoleon setting out from Nice marched from victory to victory. The several petty States of Italy, feeling their utter incapacity to deal with such an army as Napoleon's, sought shelter under the strong wings of Austria. But after the battles of Lodi and Borghetto they sued for mercy from the Corsican. In accordance with the stipulations of a treaty of June 23, 1796, the Pope abandoned Bologna and Ferrara, which had been in revolt against him, to their own fate. He agreed to furnish the French

with eight hundred horses and to hand over any hundred objects of art which the Ambassadors of the French, Morge, Berthelot and the brothers Thonin, might choose and select. The Papal soldiers, which numbered between seven or eight thousand, were beaten at Senio, fled in disorder to Faenza, but were intercepted on the way, at Ancona, where great numbers were mercilessly cut down by the French. The Pope was forced to come to terms with Bonaparte at Tolentino on February 13, 1797. He agreed to pay thirty million francs to the Corsican, who was in need of money, to revoke all former alliances of the Holy See with France, to recognize the Republic, to abandon Venaissinois, Bologna, Ferrara and Romagna to him, to furnish eight hundred horses for the French cavalry and another eight hundred, together with harness and fodder, for the French commissariat. In the following June the marches of Ancona recognized the Republic and declared themselves ready to share its fate. On December 27, 1797, the democrats of Rome, abetted by the French, stirred up an insurrection. Dispersed by the Papal grenadeos, these rioters betook themselves for shelter to the Corsini Palace, where Joseph Bonaparte, as Ambassador, enjoyed the protection of his country. In the fray General Duphot was shot down. This furnished the French with a plausible pretext for war. Joseph Bonaparte asked for his passport; General Berthier marched on Rome, where he arrived on February 10, 1798. He sent the Pope the terms of capitulation if war was to be avoided. These asked for the immediate handing over of the Castle of San Angelo to the French, the payment of six million francs and the furnishing of three thousand horses, with provisions for three months. In article eight we read: "His Holiness will keep his Guard of five hundred men. All other military troops in his service will be dismissed forthwith and their arms, stored up in the Castle of San Angelo, will become French property." The Pope, who was now without resources of any kind, accepted the terms, and on February 5 the Roman Republic was proclaimed from the Capitoline, near to the lion cage where Rienzi had met his fate. During these sad days the Swiss Guards shared the bitter sorrow of the Pope. On February 11 they had been expelled from the Quirinal by the French soldiers, but found their way to the side of the Holy Father, where they pledged themselves to die for him; on February 15, contrary to article eight of the capitulation, they were disbanded and discharged from service; on February 16 the French took possession, by force of arms and crowbars, of the passages leading to the Vatican, where they hoisted their flags. The Swiss Guards gave way to the oncoming cohorts, not by fleeing from the Eternal City, but by withdrawing to the private apartments

of the Pope. With him they finally surrendered themselves as captives of war. Again on February 17 the Swiss Guards were declared discharged—these valiant men having paid no attention whatsoever to the discharge two days before. The Pope's person was simply and by force snatched from their strong, willing hands and handed over to a guard composed of the French soldiers. Cardinal Doria Pamphili, seeing the danger of the situation, advised the Pope to leave Rome for Tuscany. On the misty night of February 20, 1798, the Holy Father, accompanied by Colonel Pfyffer and several others, took the sorrowful road of exile. Pfyffer, four days later, wrote to the Government officials of Lucern informing them of the fate of the Father of Christendom. On the thirteenth day of the following month the Lucern authorities offered their sympathy to the Pope in a letter to Pfyffer. He was charged to take in his own hands and settle without recourse to the officials at Lucern all business of a nature that called for their approval. Most of the Swiss soldiers, seeing that it was useless for them to linger longer at Rome or its environs, took their way, with heavy heart, to Switzerland. Pius VI. died on August 29, 1799, at Valence, his last thought being of the City of the Peters. His successor, Pius VII.—who took this name out of reverence for his predecessor and readiness to bear his cross—concluded peace with Napoleon in July, 1801. The Corsican was glad to come to terms with the Pope, for he was too wise not to see that the quickest, surest and cheapest way to realize his vast schemes was to enjoy, at least exteriorly, the moral support or approval of the spiritual king of the world. After all, Napoleon knew, with the intuition of genius, that he could take care himself of the political part of the game of world-subjugation. For the present, however, he must simulate friendship for him whom he would be as willing to sacrifice for his own ends as any other petty ruler who opposed his plans. The Pope, on the morrow of the treaty of July 15, 1801, confided the task of reorganizing the Papal Swiss Guards to the Lieutenant Amryhn, who was still in Rome. He at once gathered together in a regularly constituted military corps the three officers and thirty-six privates who had refused downright to leave the Eternal City during these stormy days. In 1803 Charles Pfyffer, of Altishofen, was elected colonel captain of the Guards, who now numbered sixty-four. In 1804 he made a report to the cantonal authorities of Lucern on the state of the Papal Guards. The officials in Switzerland answered by a letter, which was surcharged with expressions of joy at the reorganization of the Guards, and the consequent protection which these latter could assure the Holy Father. In August of the same year the Pope had published a

brief fixing the salary of the soldiers. But Napoleon soon found it to his own advantage to break with the Pope, and on February 21, 1808, sent General Miollis to Rome to occupy the forts. This man was no mean, ordinary jailer, and tried to bend the Pope to his own ends by slippery overtures of all kinds. But failing in this, the Corsican decreed that it was necessary for the peace of Italy—in truth for his own ends—to annex the Papal States. In his turn the Pope excommunicated Napoleon. In rage, not at the excommunication, but at the moral blow given to his plans, the Emperor ordered his satellites to lead off the Pope as a prisoner. Cardinal Pacca, who was one of the best politicians of the day, learned of this proposed course of action of Napoleon, and at once ordered the Papal Guards to keep all the approaches to the apartments of the Pope carefully closed and barricaded. On July 6 the French grenadiers, under the command of Radet, broke into the Papal Palace. The Pope, wishing to avoid the spilling of useless blood, handed himself over freely to the French. And he was led away to Fontainebleau. The Swiss Guards were discharged and disbanded because they refused to be assimilated with the French army. When Pius VII. made his entry into Rome after the fall of the Empire, the Swiss Guards were immediately reorganized under the command of Colonel Pfyffer. They acted as escort to the Pope on November 22 when he took solemn possession of his church of St. John Lateran.

The Swiss Guards numbered one hundred and two men on July 18, 1823. Of these sixty came from the Canton of Lucern, twelve from Fribourg, ten from Soleure, seven from Tessin, five from Argovie and eight from the other cantons. The officers were all natives of the Canton of Lucern. Owing to the continuous riots of the Carbonnari in Italy, the Pope wished to increase the number of his Guards. Later on, Leo XII. charged Pfyffer to enter into negotiations with the Canton of Lucern on the subject. On September 6, 1824, Edward Pfyffer, of Altishofen, and Joseph Schumacher, both members of the Great Council of Lucern, concluded an agreement with Colonel Pfyffer regarding the Guards. By the terms of this agreement the cantons agreed to furnish us more than two hundred men for the Papal corps of soldiers. All of these volunteers must be natives of one of the Catholic cantons, between the ages of eighteen to twenty-five. They allowed the opening of a recruiting office at Lucern. They reserved to themselves the right, which had been granted them by Pius IV., of proposing three candidates for the post of colonel captain. The pay of the Guards was fixed as follows:

Colonel captain, 840 Roman talers per year; lieutenant captain,

336; lieutenant, 264; quartermaster, 192; grand judge, 168; adjutant, 144; sergeant major, 144; chaplain, 144; sergeant, 144; corporal, 84; swordsman, 72; fife and drum, 84; porter, 72.

The pay was to be augmented daily when the Guards were in actual service or attendance upon the Pope. Lodgings were provided for the soldiers in the Vatican. Each soldier received a halbert, sabre and uniform every year. The colonel captain could grant furlough for a period of six months with full pay. Pensions were granted at the rate of one-half pay after twenty years of service, three-fourths after thirty years and full pay after forty years. The colonel captain must make an annual report and send the financial status of the company to the authorities in Switzerland. All other privileges and immunities were to be left untouched. Leo XII. on September 6, 1824, ratified the agreement, and the Government of Lucern did the same January 6, 1825.

The choice of the Camaldolese monk Capellari as successor to Leo XII. gave the signal for revolt in Bologna, Perugia, Foligno, Narni, Urbino, Pesaro, Tano, Sinigaglia and some other smaller towns. The Austrians quelled the revolt very quickly, feeling themselves called upon to do so by the decisions of the Congress of Layback of January, 1821. The French did the same in the Province of Romagna, which had followed the example of the other Italian rebellious towns. Now, Gregory XVI. desired to free himself of the necessity of depending for protection upon foreign help. He concluded very wisely that fresh and greater complications of a political kind must result from the presence of troops in Italy, which, though one in their desire to protect the person and prerogatives of the Vicar of Christ, were united on no other point. The Pope could not expect much assistance from the Swiss Confederation, because the newly evoked spirit of democracy had overturned the Government of the Restoration there. In 1832, however, he was rejoiced to hear that Generals Courten, of Valais, and Salis-Zizers, of the Grison district, contemplated raising an army of two thousand men and an artillery battery of one hundred and sixty men to support the just claims of the successor of St. Peter. These regiments were quickly got together, since Switzerland was filled with warriors who had but recently been discharged from the service of France, Spain and Holland. The new Pontifical army marched to Romagna, where they soon established order and tranquillity. The French and Austrians took the hint and withdrew to their respective countries. These Pontifical troops guaranteed peace abroad, whilst the Papal Guards sufficed for Rome. Colonel Pfyffer died in the City of the Popes on October 9, 1834. He was replaced by Martin Pfyffer, of Altishofen, who was the ninth and

last member of the family to hold this post of honor and responsibility.

Count John Mastai Ferretti, who had been called to govern the Church as Pius IX., gave full play to the generosity of his heart by declaring a general amnesty and promising a new civil constitution for the Papal States. Shortly afterwards all Southern Europe took revolutionary spark at the revolt of Paris in February, 1847. Milan and Venice sought to oust the Austrians, and Charles Albert, seeing the direction of the wind, gathered an army in Piedmont, which was swelled by soldiers from the other Italian States. On March 21 he declared war on Austria, and beginning in good earnest to put his threats into execution, he won the glorious victory of Goïto on May 31, 1848. The Pope had not immersed himself in these troubles, as the situation for him was delicate and complicated. But the national feeling was aroused, and the Italian, who is religious in war if nowhere else, sought to obtain the blessing of the Vicar of Christ upon his arms.

On March 23 a small body of men, on their own initiative and responsibility, had presented themselves at the door of the Papal Palace to ask for the benediction of the Pope on their enterprise. Lieutenant Gebisdorf, of Lucern, who was in command of the Guards since the resignation of Pfyffer in 1847, refused them entrance to the Quirinal. Finally, on the express desire of the Holy Father, five persons, at the head of whom was Sopranzi as spokesman, were admitted into his presence. On their repeated solicitations and entreaties the Pope at last consented to bless the standard which they had smuggled into the palace. He dismissed them with the words: "Go—defend the frontier!" At once the report was spread throughout Rome that the Pope not only countenanced, but also blessed the uprising of the populace. Neapolitan and Roman soldiers at once began military movements. The auxiliary troops of the Pontifical States soon numbered seventeen thousand men. General Durando was put at the head of all the troops. The foreign regiments were under the command of Caspar de La Tour, a native of the Grison district. The first regiment was composed of the battalions of Gut and Balettaz. The second regiment was commanded by Colonel Philip Schaller, and was made up of the battalions of Quartery and Kaiser. The artillery was under the command of the Captains Lentulus, of Bern, and Xavier Meyer de Schauensee. The Swiss victoriously drove back the Austrians on May 24. On June 8 Radetzky left Verona with three divisions of the army to attack Vicenza. The battle which followed two days later was bloody to a degree, and four hundred Swiss were left behind on the field. Vicenza had to raise the white flag,

and Radetzky refused to treat with the Italians. Hence Colonels de La Tour, Schaller and Balettaz, at 11 o'clock in the night, went to the Austrian camp to draw up the terms of capitulation. Peace was made on the most favorable terms for the vanquished. The remainder of the army moved on to Rome, and the Senate, by a decree of June 20, 1848, gave to every Swiss soldier who had fought at Vicenza the rights and privileges of Roman citizens, whilst General La Tour received papers of Roman nobility. The Austrians followed up their first success. But the Pope withdrew from the fray. Schaller and other officers took the way to their homes in the hope of thus putting an honorable end to the trouble. The troops, however, remained behind, shortly to become the target for the French Revolutionaries. On September 3 of the following year Xavier Meyer de Schauensee was, on the triple recommendation of the Canton of Lucern, named colonel captain of the Papal Swiss Guards.

Now it happened on November 15 of the same year of 1848 that Count Rossi, chief minister and adviser of Pius IX., was shot down in cold blood as he was awaiting the opening session of the Chamber. The following day Rome was in the throes of war. No one could assign a ready reason for the insurrection that was sufficient. But the ordinary man, the Christian man above all, was not supposed to be able to give a reason for things that were taking place every day on every side. The reasons were known to a select few men who depended for support on those powers of Europe which were inimical to the Holy See, and whose statesmen had banded together in a powerful secret society to gain their ends. The Roman agitators, under the leadership of Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, betook themselves in haste and disorder to the Quirinal to submit to the Pope a new list of ministers of state whom they had chosen to rule Rome on other than Papal lines. The Pope, as was his right and duty, calmly refused to recognize the choice which had been made. He made appeal to a principle which these men knew nothing of—conscience. The storm was breaking, and every one in Rome knew it. Colonel Meyer de Schauensee, on the hint of Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, distributed arms and ammunition to the seventy-four Swiss Guards who were in the palace. The Cardinal promised to join the soldiers himself, if he was needed, to defend the Pope. He uttered the very significant words: "We will be there to die with you"—words which have been variously interpreted by historical exegetes. The Swiss bravely drove back the first storming of the gates by the mob which surged—it knew not why—in the plaza before the palace. Every soldier who ventured too far away from the small

corps inside became the object for the mob to wreak its anger upon. The sergeant major, Martin Grütter, addressed the mob with words of reason, but mobs, especially Roman mobs, know not reason. He received a sharp blow on his arm from a club, which tore his uniform. And the assembled men cried out deliriously: "Death to the Swiss! Down with the Croats of the Palace!" And then all the gates of the palace were bolted! And the mob heard a volley of shots which was discharged in the courtyard in the hope of intimidating the crowd outside. Then they cried out, in loud tones: "They are murdering our own inside!" It was the cry of a Roman mob. And then the fifteen civic guards who had been stationed in the courtyard were asked to retire. But the mob on beholding them leave the palace, safe and sound, would not believe its eyes. Meyer volunteered to accompany them if they would but promise to see that no wanton harm befell him on their account. Near the fountain of waters on Monte Cavallo the men deserted Meyer, who was at once surrounded by a crowd of men, who asked him this question: "Who are you for—the people or the Pope?" Meyer answered: "I am for my duty. Put hands, if you dare, on an officer who fought for Italian liberties at Vicenza." They allowed him to go his way. Soon, however, he was again taken in charge by another band of rioters and placed before the muzzle of a loaded cannon. Before the leaders of the mob had time to ask him any questions, Meyer said: "I recognize this piece of artillery. It is called 'San Pietro.' If you fire it, history will always relate that on November 16 the Romans put an officer to death with a cannon which he and twenty-five of his men captured at Vicenza!" The rioters did not put him to death. But they only released him after night had fallen.

Some time in the afternoon the door of the palace facing the Via Pia took fire for some unknown, but not unsuspected reason. The Swiss Guards hastened to put out the blaze. Then it was that shots were heard, and when the smoke had cleared away it was found that Mgr. Palma had been shot down in his own apartments while looking out of his window on the mob. The ruffians then stormed into the palace with clubs and crowbars and other such like arms. Pius IX., wishing to avoid further bloodshed, made known his determination to hand himself over to the revolutionaries. But an unforeseen difficulty stood in the way. For the Swiss soldiers were in holiest rebellion. They refused to let their master go. "We will fight for you, Holy Father, until not a single one of us remains. We are willing to die rather than yield up our arms. Only if you ask us to lay aside our weapons will we agree to put them at your feet." The Pope did beg them to hand over

their arms to the civil guards. The Pope was allowed to have his soldiers with him for another three months. The names of these brave and loyal soldiers, whose devotion touched the saddened heart of the great Pontiff to the inmost, deserve eternal remembrance. They are as follows:

Xavier Leodegard Meyer de Schauensee, colonel captain.

James Gebisdorf, first lieutenant.

Alexander Pfyffer, quartermaster.

Peter Herzog, grand judge.

Grütter, of Lucern, sergeant major.

James Sturny, of Fribourg; Schmidt, of Lucern; Burkert, of Soleure; Tosetti, of Tessin, sergeants.

In the troop there were twenty men from the Canton of Lucern, eleven from Soleure, eight from Fribourg, nine from the small cantons, six from Argovie, four from Valais, two from St. Gall, two from Tessin, two from the Grison district and one from Thurgovie.

Through the assistance and good offices of the Countess Spaur, Pius IX., on November 24, 1848, took refuge at Gaeta, in the kingdom of Naples. Here he remained in voluntary exile till April 12, 1850, when, owing to the invasion of Rome by the French army, he was allowed to return to his capital city. The Pope no longer treated officially with the Swiss cantons, since, according to the Federal Constitution of 1848, the disbanding of the Guards was looked upon as a grievance. Meyer de Schauensee, however, on the desire of the Pope, set to the task of reorganizing the Swiss Guards. A Papal decree of 1858 confirming the clauses of capitulation of 1824 fixed the status of the Guards for the future. The Guards were thereafter to be composed of a body of picked men, one hundred and seventeen in number. This arrangement must have taken place before the Pope's return to Rome, for on that occasion we find the Guards acting as hereditary and rightful escort to the Holy Father. The Pope's first public act, after his exile was over, was the solemn blessing of the arms and standards of the Swiss Guards. He also organized two divisions of Guards in the Legations, which were put under the command of Generals Schmidt, of Ury, and De Courten, of Valais. Italy once more enjoyed a breathing space of peace. The Pope, to show his affection for his people and win their loyalty, set out on a visit of the provinces. During the journey, which lasted four months, he was accompanied by his Guards. Everywhere he was received with enthusiasm and affection.

In July, 1858, Cavour and Napoleon III., began to conspire between themselves to disturb the peace of Italy. War was de-

clared on Austria on April 26, 1859. France promised to deliver Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic. The battles of Magenta and Solferino prepared the way for the treaty of peace of Villafranca (July 11, 1859). Austria received Venice and thought of making way for an Italian Confederation under the honorary presidency of the Pope. On May 3, 1859, Pius IX. in a short note to the powers of Europe declared the neutrality of the Papal States. Hardly had the Austrians departed from Ravenna, Bologna and Ferrara when the Legations declared Victor Emmanuel dictator. The Pope protested in an encyclical of June 18, 1859, and asked the French for protection, which they did not vouchsafe to give, as they were already beginning to bargain with Piedmont for Nice and Savoy. Perugia took occasion of the general confusion to rise in revolt. Colonel Schmidt, at the head of the Papal troops, hastened thither to put down the popular insurrection. In seven days he had restored complete order. The Pope raised Schmidt to the rank of general for the good service he had rendered with such expedition.

The idea of Italian unity was making rapid progress among all classes of the people of the north of Italy. The secret propaganda which was responsible for this was carried on with consummate dexterity. It was an idea which was all too seductive to the perfervid Italian imagination. Men did not stop to reason or think—they were carried off their feet by the popular cause. Pius IX., therefore, reading well the signs of the time and feeling certain that little help was to be looked for from Italians, made an appeal for soldiers to the Catholic countries of Europe, just as Urban II. at Clermont had lifted his voice against the Moslem Orient and had been answered by the tramp of soldiers' feet throughout Christendom. The Catholic world was roused to enthusiasm by this petition for help from a Father and Pontiff whose cup of sorrows nothing seemed able to fill. Germans, Austrians, Belgians, Irish and Canadians came from all sides to take their stand under the banner of the Pope. In 1860 there were at Rome six thousand two hundred Italian soldiers, with five thousand more from the provinces; five battalions of German and Austrian bersagliere; seven or eight hundred Irishmen; a battalion of miscellaneous soldiers from all parts, of whom two-thirds were Swiss, under the command of Jeannerat, a native of the Bernois Jura; a regiment of French and Belgian troops, under the command of Bec de Lievre; a Swiss regiment composed of the battalions of Alet and Cropt; several batteries of artillery and one squadron of cavalry—a total of nearly eighteen thousand men. The army was divided into three divisions; the first, under General Schmidt, was stationed at Foligno; the second, under General Pimodan, of Fribourg, was stationed at

Spoleto; the third, under Lieutenant de Courten, was stationed at Macerata. The other remaining troops were posted at Ancona and strong points along the frontier. The commander-in-chief of the Pontifical army, who had been chosen by Mgr. Merode, Minister of War, was General Lamoriciere, whose life has been so beautifully told by Mgr. Baunard. He was a well-trying warrior, having gone through eighteen campaigns. His valor obtained for him the Governorship of Algiers. He took command of the forces on April 6, 1860, but had no time, before the outbreak of hostilities, to dispose of his heterogeneous army to the best advantage. Piedmont took instant advantage of this by beginning a series of small engagements on the frontier. On March 14, 1860, the people of Romagna, of the Duchy of Modena and Parma ("Parma, that constant thorn in the side of the Papal States") and of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany were incorporated into Piedmont on their own earnest request. Garibaldi, in September, won many soldiers to his side in Sicily and Naples. A Piedmontese army, under the command of General Fanti, took up position on the frontier of the Papal States in order to maintain peace and order, it was alleged. General Sonnaz penetrated with his troops into Umbria and Tuscany. Schmidt, having long withstood the assaults of the enemy at a dozen points, was forced at last to capitulate at Perugia on September 13 with seventeen hundred men. Lamoriciere, whose troops were dispersed over a wide area for purposes of defense, appeared at Loretto on September 16, where he was joined by the forces of Pimodan. The following day Pimodan attacked two fortresses, but was driven back with great losses to the French and Belgian contingent of his men. He fought bravely, though wounded thrice, until struck down by a traitor, Brambilla, who had stolen into the ranks. Three hours the slaughter went on. But the Pontifical troops lost the day and escaped to Ancona with forty-five horses and a few remaining soldiers. Here little protection could be looked for, as the fortifications were still in the first stages of construction. After several skirmishes, such as those of Monte Pelago and San Stefano, Mole and Lanterno, the army surrendered. General Fanti, in utter disregard of the laws of military conduct, continued to bombard the fort for twelve hours after the white flag had been hoisted. On the last day of the month three hundred and forty-eight officers and seven thousand men were allowed to withdraw on the promise of abstaining from military operations against Piedmont for the space of one year.

Umbria, the Marches and the Two Sicilies now expressed a desire to cast their lot with Piedmont. On February 18, 1861, Victor Emmanuel was proclaimed King of Italy. In 1864 he transferred

his court to Florence from Turin. In vain had the Pope protested against these flagrant usurpations. All the Papal cities, except Rome, Civita-Vecchia, Comarca and Viterbo, were now abandoned to the Piedmontese by the Pontifical troops on the advice of Count de La None, who insisted that every effort should be made to preserve these cities at least for the Pope.

Colonel Meyer de Schauensee died at Rome in 1859. The Pope did not appoint a successor immediately, owing to the unsettled state of affairs. Only in the year 1861 was Alfred Sonnenberg appointed as head of the Papal Swiss Guards. He was a valiant warrior who had fought in many campaigns abroad. General Kanzler was named Minister of Arms and De Courten and Zappi commanders. The Swiss Guard, the Noble Guard and the Guard Palatine were attached exclusively to the service of the Pope and his household. The Holy Father often conferred with Sonnenberg concerning the reorganization of the Pontifical army. This was necessary at the moment, for every one could see that the revolution would throw itself, sooner or later, with all its force, on the City of the Popes. Napoleon III. had promised Victor Emmanuel to withdraw his troops from Rome if he would guarantee to maintain the independence of the Pope. The last of the French troops left Rome on December 6, 1866. Immediately the club of Garibaldians at Bologna let loose the cry: "Rome the Capital City of United Italy!" Preparations of war were begun everywhere with the tacit approbation and connivance of the Government. The Pontifical troops, in an incredibly short space of time, were attacked at twenty-four different places by the men whose aim it was to take Rome at the proper moment. For the present it was the tactics of Italy to withdraw the attention of the Papal troops from the city of Rome. At Porta Salara forty Swiss soldiers dispersed a small band of Garibaldians who had come down the Tiber for the purpose of vexing the small forces guarding the city. Captain Julius Meyer, of Algovie, on December 23, with forty-two men, had an engagement at close quarters with another detachment of Garibaldians at Aqua Acetosa, Cairolì, of Pavia, the leader of the band, which was entirely made up of the élite of the Masonic lodges, after having inflicted three wounds from his musket and six others with his bayonet on Meyer, fell under the blows of Hofstetter, a valiant Swiss private, who hastened to the rescue.

These and various other incidents were noised abroad throughout Europe. Napoleon, in order to save appearances and his own honor, sent a troop of soldiers to Rome on October 29. Cialdini, with forty thousand men, had already drawn up a line of barricade on the frontier of the Papal States. Garibaldi saw that it was the

hour to strike a bold stroke. On October 26 he attacked Monte Rotondo with forty-five hundred men, and kept up fire for forty-eight hours. On November 3 his troops took position at Mentana, but after a long struggle were forced to retreat. Garibaldi, with his two daughters, had to flee for safety. The Pontifical troops reported only thirty-two dead and one hundred and thirty-nine wounded. The victorious troops entered Rome amid shouts of enthusiasm on the following day. Pius IX. granted pardon to all prisoners of war except Monti and Tognetti. Rome was quiet for some months to come. It was the lull before the breaking of the storm!

The foreign troops in the employ of the Holy See were now organized into a separate company. The list of officers was as follows: Jeannerat, commander, with Castella and Meyer, lieutenants; Louis de Courten, adjutant major; Wasescha, of the Grison district, major; Peter Esseiva, of Fribourg, auditor; Schroeder, treasurer; Henry Gauthier, captain.

When war broke out between France and Prussia in 1870 Napoleon III. took the opportunity to recall his troops from Rome. On August 4 and 6, the last French soldiers embarking from Civita-Vecchia, left Rome to the mercy of the Italians. On September 10 General Ponza di San Martino handed an ultimatum from Victor Emmanuel to the Pope. Pius IX. was given his choice between handing over the Papal States to the King or meeting an invading army of forty thousand men—"patriots" the ultimatum called them. The Pope instantly refused the alternative of surrender. On the 12th the Italian soldiers set foot on the soil of St. Peter's Patrimony. Two days later they stood before the gates of Rome. On the morning of the 20th of September firing began. The invaders were kept at bay at each of the three Roman gates. Whilst the Swiss Guards kept ever close to the Pope to defend his person, a regiment of foreign soldiers in the Pope's employ defended the approaches to the city, especially the Porta Pia. The Piedmontese lost heavily, for they stood under the clean fire of the Pontifical troops. Then a bayonet charge was made. The Pope's soldiers stood firm and dealt out death in terrible earnest. Then a French officer hoisted the white flag. The Papal soldiers obeyed instantly but reluctantly. But they had been betrayed! For the Italians rushed upon the defenseless Papal soldiers—and thus gained entrance into the city. It was a black, vile, dastardly piece of treason. The Pope protested in vigorous terms to the diplomatic corps which gathered in the Vatican to draw up the terms of surrender and capitulation. But these men did not see fit to take their stand on the side of righteousness, and we need not wonder at this, for some, as Count

Arnim, of Prussia, were in collusion with the Piedmontese. The capitulation was signed at the Villa Albani by Cadorna and Kauzler. The following day the Pontifical troops were discharged from service. On October 2, 1870, a fictitious plebiscite, engineered by the invaders, voted for the union of Rome and the Patrimony of St. Peter to the United Kingdom of Italy. The annexation was ratified six days later. Iniquity had done its worst! And so we cannot wonder that Pius IX. washed his hands clean of the "Law of Guarantees" (March 13, 1871), by which the Italians tried to chloroform their consciences and rehabilitate themselves before the decent and respectable part of the world. The Pope became a voluntary prisoner in the Vatican, where a band of Swiss Guards persisted in staying in order to maintain order amongst the crowds of pilgrims who came from the entire world to see the White Father of Christendom, who never appeared more white and heavenly and lamb-like than now when he was surrounded by a people that proved itself treacherous and a Government that meant to follow the devious ways of crooked and unscrupulous politics. The Papal Prisoner became the only powerful man in Italy, because he was recognized as the only honest political figure. The recent jubilee exhibitions, commemorative of this colossal piece of nineteenth century brigandage, have not been able to allure the tourist and curious sightseer to Italy. Even the Italians grew little enthusiastic at the pyrotechnic exhibition which was intended to arouse a spirit of patriotism and national solidarity in a land where these have vanished. The Italian war in the East may yet open the eyes of Italy to the futility of fighting against manifest justice as represented in the claims of the successor of St. Peter.

It is true to say that never before has the Papacy been looked upon so universally by the world as the one pure political spot in Italy. Leo XIII. ravished the world with his wisdom and statesmanship, whilst the Italian Parliament could not preserve itself from becoming more and more, every day, the theatre of burlesque statecraft. We have grown accustomed to expect anything from Italian politics but truth and honest dealing. Leo XIII. loved his Swiss Guard and appointed Louis de Courten, glorious with the scars of more than one campaign for the Papal prerogatives upon him, successor to Sonnenberg as colonel captain (November 11, 1878). The Holy Father also supplied his soldiers with Remington rifles to be carried when on duty, reserving the use of halberts for parade at the Porta di Bronza and the Porta della Zecca. He also ordered that the "Four Great Swords," which the Swiss had sent to Rome as an *ex voto* offering after the battle of Morat in 1476, be carried beside the *sedia gestatoria* of the

Pope in all public functions in St. Peter's. Henceforth, on either side of the Pope, these trophies of the Swiss over the forces of Bourgoyne are brought forth to show, by symbolic representation, that the Catholic cantons have ever stood out as the champions of the temporal power of the Popes. The "Spadoni," as they are called, take us back over four hundred years of history—a long period of time in which more than one nation has fallen away from its high estate as friend and supporter of the just claims of the Fisherman King.

The story of the Swiss Papal Guards, which has been briefly told here after the monographs of Schaller and Lütolf, is one to encourage and inspirit every Catholic heart. The Swiss Guards, by the mere fact of their survival to this day, repeat the words which a great French statesman, whom we cannot suspect of sympathy for the Holy See, repeated on three separate occasions: "As to the Papacy, there can be no independence for it but absolute sovereignty. Here lies a concern of the first order before which all private interests of nations must give way; just as in a state the public good must be preferred to the good of individuals."

EUSTACE HAMPOOLE, O. P.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

A PATRIARCHAL personality among penmen was the late Justin McCarthy, whose death at Folkestone, on April 24, has been chronicled with the widespread regret it evoked, although it was not unexpected, considering his advanced age and long-enfeebled health.

Born on the southern side of Cork city, where Windmill road adjoins Evergreen street, on November 22, 1830, he was about midway in his eighty-second year. Journalist, novelist, historian and politician, as a London editor, when the leading journals of the British metropolis, perhaps, exercised more direct influence over public opinion than they do now, since the spread of education and the possession of power has taught the people to do their own thinking; as a writer of fiction, the products of whose fertile fancy have attracted and fascinated countless readers in both hemispheres; as the chronicler of the events of times past and present—of reigns so diverse in interest as those of Queen Anne, the Georges, Victoria and Edward II.; as a patriotic parliamentarian who bravely and courageously plants the flag of Irish nationality on the walls of Derry—that stronghold of the Williamites defended

by Walker—and as chairman of the Irish party at a critical epoch in the struggle for regaining Ireland's autonomy, he won distinction in every sphere of the domains of literature and politics in which he figured during his long and well-filled life.

There was something striking in the passing of Justin McCarthy on the morrow of the day which witnessed the assembling in Dublin of a national convention on such an historic occasion as the introduction into the Imperial Parliament of a third measure of Home Rule, expounded by the man upon whom the mantle of Parnell had fallen to delegates from all parts of the island, who gave it their unanimous approval. It marked the parting of the ways, the passing of the old order and the advent of the new. If Justin McCarthy did not live to see the full noon of legislative freedom shed its light over the land he loved and served, he saw the dawning of the brighter day illumining the political horizon.

He was a self-exiled Irishman who never forgot the land that gave him birth. He always cherished an abiding fondness for his native city. Lecturing there several years ago, he applied to himself the words of another distinguished Irishman, Oliver Goldsmith:

Wher'er I roam, whatever realms I see,
My heart, untraveled, fondly turns to thee.

It has been called "the beautiful city;" though it is not the city itself that is beautiful, but its environs. In his "Story of an Irishman," which is his autobiography, he writes: "My earliest memories of life are associated with river and sea and low-lying hills, with meadows and gardens and distant views of bolder heights crowned with some ancient ruin." Of Cork harbor, which competes with Sydney for the prize of beauty as an ideal haven, he says: "I have seen many rivers and harbors in foreign countries on this side of the Atlantic and the other, but I have seldom looked upon a scene more fascinating to the eye and the mind than that which was so familiar to my boyhood. The hero of that really great Irish novel, *The Collegians*, when contemplating in a moment of melancholy retrospection the delights of his boyish days, dwells with special rapture on 'my boat, the broad river, the rough west wind, the broken waves and the heart at rest.' I think I may allow these words to sum up the principle joys of life as they presented themselves to the minds and the senses of the young men with whom I was best acquainted in the years before the great Irish famine of '46 and '47 had spread its desolation over the land."

His father was conducting clerk to the Messrs. Exham, a respectable firm of solicitors still represented in the city, and he was himself for a time in their offices with a view to ultimately joining the legal profession, if fortune favored. Fortune did not favor,

and literature, not law, claimed him as its own. His father and mother (née Ellen Canty) and his schoolmaster, John Goolding, of whom he has drawn an admirable pen-portrait in the book just quoted, gave him a literary bent, or rather helped to develop the literary gift which was latent. His father, Michael Francis McCarthy—the son of a hairdresser in Blackpool, a northern suburb of the city—was a man of literary culture, with a special attraction for Irish archæology, and, after filling for a time the position of chief clerk at the Cork Petty Sessions Court, also drifted into journalism.¹ Of him his son writes: "He was a man of much reading, with a thorough love of books and, as I believe, a distinct literary gift which might, under other conditions, have enabled him to win some position as a writer. He wrote many poems and essays which, I still think, gave promise for a literary career; but he only wrote occasionally and never gave himself up or had the means to give himself up to the writer's calling. He had had the honor of conversing with Sir Walter Scott when the great novelist paid his visit to Ireland; he had met Thomas Moore and had some personal acquaintanceship with Lady Morgan, Gerald Griffin and the Rev. Francis Mahony. My father was well acquainted with Latin and Greek, more especially with Greek, a language for which he had an intense affection, and he was familiar with most of the great classical authors." He was one of a convivial literary coterie who dubbed themselves "The Mowers," because they drank nothing but the "barley mow,"² and used to foregather of nights in a tavern in Fishamble lane, a narrow passage long since improved away by the widening out of Liberty street.

The first half of the last century was an epoch when writers of the highest mark in prose and verse gave it a special literary tone, and though far removed from the great centre of literary activity, Cork was not slow to assimilate the prevailing taste for letters, so much so that Thackeray, though he "skitted" at Dublin, in his *Irish Sketch Book*, spoke of Cork citizens as "the most book-loving people" he ever met." Books were not then so easily procurable. The presses of Great Britain did not yet pour out such a flood of fictional literature as now deluges the reading world; writers did not write nor publishers print so fast. More thought and time were devoted to the production and reading of books. Young men were not mentally nurtured on snippets journalism and sensational novels. John Windele, the antiquary; John

¹ He died in Cork late in the fifties of the last century, and is buried in St. Joseph's Cemetery. His wife (the novelist's mother) died in London, and is buried in Kensal Green. The novelist himself now rests in Hampstead Cemetery.

² Fermented malt.

Augustus Shea, a local poet who early emigrated to America, drifted into journalism, became one of the sub-editors of the *New York Tribune* under Horace Greeley, and whose son became Chief Justice of New York; Joseph Snow and Joseph O'Leary, who became London journalists, were among "The Mowers" in the elder McCarthy's time. His daughter, Ella (the novelist's sister), was an accomplished linguist and published in the "Cork Magazine," edited by her father, translations from Georges Sand, Petrarch and Alfieri; while the novelist's mother, who was an assiduous reader of novels of the old school, may be credited with some share in transmitting to her son an attraction towards fiction, which he turned to such profitable account. His sister was born early in 1829, which circumstance occasioned his mother to remark that while Ella was born a slave, Justin was born a free man, having come into the world the year after Emancipation.

One who had no inconsiderate share in developing Justin McCarthy's literary talent was John Goolding, a well-known classical teacher, whom he calls "my own schoolmaster" and of whom he draws a fancy portrait under the fictional disguise of "Mr. Conrad" in his novel "Mononia." "The great result of his system of teaching," he says, "was that it filled us with a desire to understand and appreciate every author we read and to extend our field of knowledge. I do not believe that I should ever have gained, in the same short time under a different system of teaching, such a love for the best in literature as Mr. Goolding's education awakened in my own mind. It was, in truth, literary rather than scholastic instruction, but as such it suited me and most of my comrades quite well enough, which, I think, was something which did high credit to a small school in an Irish provincial city. I took leave of Mr. Goolding and his school with the deepest regret. I saw him often afterwards. He was a frequent visitor at our home, and his friendship was never lessened by any of the worldly troubles which soon came upon us. He passed away from life³ not many years after our separation, but he never passed out of my recollection, and it is no excess of words to say that his memory and his influence are with me still. I think John Goolding was, in his quiet and honest way, one of the most remarkable men I have ever known. He was certainly the most remarkable man I have ever known who actually came to nothing so far as worldly success was concerned. I have not met any man who, on the whole, could give evidence of a large amount of intellectual accomplishments. . . . It seemed to be that there was ever a prevailing tone of melancholy in his life, and I have often been led to the

³ November, 1867.

belief that some profound disappointment must have come upon his earlier career. . . . There are few men with whom I have ever been brought into companionship to whom I owe a higher debt of gratitude than that which I acknowledge to my one schoolmaster, and can only thus repay." The "melancholy" which Mr. McCarthy noted and the "profound disaappointment" which he surmised were traceable to his abrupt departure from Maynooth, where he spent about three years, and where among his fellow-students were the future Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. McHale; the late Bishop of Down and Connor, Dr. Denvir; Dean Meyler, of Dublin; Archdeacon O'Keeffe, of Cork, and Father Croke, P. P., of Charleville, uncle of the late Archbishop Croke, of Cashel. He left for no unworthy reason, without reaching any orders, and doubtless often regretted it as a false step. He was afterwards the private tutor of Edmund O'Reilly, the distinguished Irish Jesuit, quoted by "Cardinal Newman as "a great authority" in his famous reply to Gladstone's anti-Vatican pamphlet. Mr. McCarthy says he "spent some years in Rome;" but this is an error. He was never out of Ireland.⁴

He had barely entered on his seventeenth years when home troubles threw upon him the responsibility of being the chief breadwinner of the family. Through the friendly offices of the genial and gifted John Francis Maguire, then proprietor and editor, he was engaged on the reporting staff of the *Cork Examiner*, for which he received the munificent remuneration of a pound a week, being soon after joined by his lifelong friend, Thomas Crosbie. "The set to which I belonged in those younger days of mine," he recalls, "was especially and often intensely literary and artistic. We were nearly all poor, but we all belonged to families in which education counted for much and where scholarly studies always found encouragement. There was little chance then of university education for the Catholic youths who made up the rising generation of Ireland. The education of young fellows whose parents could not afford to pay for their schooling was chiefly conducted by monks of the various orders, and these seem to have done their work of teaching marvelously well. I can positively affirm that among the young fellows who were my closest companions, and whose parents almost all belonged to what I may describe as a struggling class, there was not one who could only read the English language. We could read our Latin and make something of our

⁴ See a biographical sketch of this interesting character which I wrote for the *Ecclesiastical Review* (June, 1908), under the heading "The Late Archbishop Murphy and His Irish Schoolmaster," based on a manuscript diary by Mr. Goolding and given to me by himself when I was his pupil.

Greek; most of us could read French, some few Italian, and many of us were taking to the study of German."

There were at that time two well-organized literary societies in the city—the Literary and Scientific, which still flourishes as a centre of intellectual culture and where he first practiced speaking in public, and Father Mathew's Temperance Institute, the library and reading room of which were opened to all creeds and of which Dr. Kenealy, then a young barrister destined to earn notoriety as the advocate of the Tichborne claimant, was president. "My memory," records Mr. McCarthy, "does not go back to a time when I did not love to get a book into my hands and turn over its pages, and I can safely say that this inclination of mine was in working force even before I was quite able to read the printed words on the pages. We were a reading family and we lived among a reading set. I have never been in any social circle on this side of the Atlantic or the other where a greater love for literature and art prevailed than was to be found among those with whom I chiefly associated during the twenty years or so of my unbroken residence in Cork city."

Among his companions of those days who later forged their way to the front in public life by sheer dint of ability, was the late Sir John Pope Hennessy, a protégé of Disraeli, who, like his patron, pursued politics like a profession and became that political *rara avis*, an Irish Catholic Conservative. Another contemporary was Maxwell Sullivan, who emigrated to the United States and fought and fell in the great Civil War; a cousin of McCarthy's, named Tom Walker, who, impelled by the Irish love of military adventure, obtained a commission in the British army and was one of the first victims of the fatal fire at Cawnpore; and one whom he calls his "oldest and dearest friend," the late Mr. Thomas Crosbie, the accomplished editor of the *Cork Examiner*.

When Justin McCarthy was a reporter on that paper—then a tri-weekly—the Young Ireland movement was in full swing, and *The Nation* newspaper, founded by Gavan Duffy and John Blake Dillon, and written with striking ability, was making history and literature. It appealed with fervor and force to the sentiments of a distinctive nationality which is unchanged and indestructible. Like all young Irishmen of generous sympathies and high ideals, he was rapidly drawn into the whirl and current of the movement, which, though it ended ingloriously in a scuffle in a cabbage garden at Ballingarry, breathed a soul and a spirit into the Ireland of its time. He was one of the three reporters sent by the *Examiner* to report the famous state trial of Smith, O'Brien, Thomas Francis Meagher and others at the Special Commission in Clonmel, ren-

dered memorable by Whiteside's brilliant forensic eloquence. Yielding to an impulse of hero worship, born of the contagious enthusiasm of the epoch, he had a volume of Moore's poetical works sent into the dock with a request for Meagher's autograph. It came back to him with the lines—

Oh! for a tongue to curse the slave
Whose treason, like a withering blight,
Hung o'er the counsels of the brave
To blast them in their hour of might.

written by O'Connell's great protagonist, whose championship of physical versus moral force earned for him the name of "Meagher of the sword." It was on this occasion also he first came into personal contact with Sir William Howard Russell, the famous war correspondent of the *Times*.

Notwithstanding his nationalism and the fine frenzy of '48, the young Irish journalist looked to England for a wider and more remunerative sphere for the exercise of his talents. London, even more then than now, had a kind of lodestone attraction for provincial journalists. Thither he made his way early in 1852. After an unsuccessful attempt to obtain a place on some London paper, he returned to Cork. This visit was followed by another for the purpose of reporting the proceedings of a committee of the House of Commons for the *Examiner*. His next employment was as special reporter of a commission of inquiry into the state of the fairs and markets of Ireland conducted by Captain Hercules Robinson. At length he was enabled to break fresh ground by securing his first newspaper engagement on the English side of the Channel. This was on the *Northern Daily Times* of Liverpool. During his sojourn in the great seaport on the Mersey he reported Dr. Newman's famous lectures on the Turkish dominion in Europe, delivered at the Catholic Institute in Hope street, one of the many useful institutions founded by the late Monsignor Nugent. There also he launched out as a public lecturer, selecting Goethe as his subject, and began to contribute to magazines, enlivening the pages of the *Porcupine*, a Liverpool counterpart of *Punch*. An article on the Schiller centenary, written for the *London Quarterly*, so pleased the chairman of the committee that they presented him with an exquisite medallion of Schiller's head modeled in clay. He had already received a fee of nine guineas from the same magazine for another article.

This measure of success in literature, apart from journalism, encouraged him to set his face once more towards London. This last effort to obtain a foothold in the metropolis after failing to get on the *Daily News*, to the editor of which he was introduced by Miss Martineau, was crowned with success. In 1859, on the

invitation of the editor, Samuel Lucas, he joined the *Morning Star*, the organ of Cobden and Bright, with whom he was afterwards, when promoted to the editorship, brought into frequent and intimate relations. From the reporters' gallery in the House of Commons he was advanced to the post of foreign sub-editor, and, as special correspondent, described the coronation at Königsberg of William I., King of Prussia, afterwards proclaimed Emperor of Germany at Versailles, after the close of the war with France in 1870.

If intrinsic merit would secure the continuance of a paper, the *Star* deserved to live, for it was ably served. As writers on its staff or among its contributors it had William Black, the novelist; Archibald Forbes, Edmund Yates, Leicester Buckingham, Richard Whiteing, author of *No. 5 John Street*; Charles Cooper, who became editor of the *Scotsman*; E. D. J. Wilson, a fellow-Corkman, one of the *Times*' leader writers, and E. R. Russell. After Lucas' death Justin McCarthy succeeded him as editor-in-chief. The editor of a London daily is an important personality in the political, literary and social world, and occupying such a position, Mr. McCarthy came often into personal relations with Browning, Tennyson, Carlyle, Dickens and Thackeray. Still, he did not allow his journalistic work, exacting as it was, to debar him from pursuing literature properly so called. An article on Voltaire in the *Westminster Review* attracted the notice of John Stuart Mill, who expressed a wish to know the writer, which was the beginning of an acquaintance that ripened into friendship. Another article on Buckle's *History of Civilization* also won that philosophical radical's approval.

A new phase of his career was opened when he published his first novel. This was a highly sensational novel, which he subsequently withdrew from circulation and suppressed altogether. It was written at the prompting of a publisher with the view of pushing the sale of another book the author was more anxious to bring out, but which the astute bibliopole thought would "catch on" better if it had the name of the writer of a sensational work on its title page. It was followed by *The Waterdale Neighbors* and *My Enemy's Daughter*, the latter title, which is somewhat inconsequential, having been suggested by Miss Braddon. About the same time he republished his magazine articles in a volume bearing the title *Con Amore*.

The next phase of his diversified life was consequent on his severance of his connection with the *Star*. Bright had a strong conviction that it was not right for a member of an Administration to have anything to do with the control of a newspaper, and, when he joined the Liberal Government, withdrew from the proprietary

of the *Morning Star*. This led to Mr. McCarthy resigning the editorship. "No memories of my life," he writes, "are more sacred to me than the recollections of my long intercourse with John Bright. I felt that when he should cease to have anything to do with the *Star* my principal motive for holding my laborious position would be gone."

Lalor Sheil in one of his speeches spoke of "the patient drudgery of the Forum;" but the labor of the Law Courts is recreation compared to the unrelaxed drudgery of editing a daily morning paper. Self-liberated from this drudgery, Mr. McCarthy visited the United States at the instance of Cyrus Field, who gave him letters of introduction to distinguished Americans. In September, 1868, he crossed the Atlantic for the first time, to be greeted, on landing at Hoboken, by his brother Frank, who, a naturalized citizen of the great Republic of the West, had served in the American war. Among the prominent people whom he met were W. C. Bryant, who gave him his first introduction to social life in New York city; Horace Greeley, then editor and chief owner of the *New York Tribune*, who attracted him by "his homespun simplicity and curious felicity of ideas and language;" Charles Sumner, the great orator of Negro emancipation; Wendell Phillips, the anti-slavery advocate, one of the greatest orators whom he ever heard and whom he ranks as a speaker with Gladstone and Bright; William Lloyd Garrison, another famous leader of the abolition movement; George William Curtis, author, journalist and lecturer, whom he eulogizes as "one of the most charming writers and fascinating speakers in the United States;" Bayard Taylor, poet, novelist and traveler, and Whitelaw Reid, then attached to the literary staff of the *Tribune* and afterwards United States Minister in London. Settling down for a time in America, where he made many friends, he devoted himself to literature and journalism, forming a connection with the *New York Independent* and the publishing house of Harper Brothers, for whose monthly magazine he wrote several short stories and with whom he made a contract to supply a hundred of such, a contract which, in due time, he fulfilled. Touring the States from New York to San Francisco, he visited Minneapolis and New Orleans, met Brigham Young in Salt Lake City, and lectured in the Cooper Institute on the manner in which public opinion in England had manifested itself during the Civil War—a ticklish subject, which he dexterously handled, as English opinion, so far as it was reflected or directed by the London press, the clubs and "society," blunderingly sided with the South against the North. Mr. McCarthy, who was an ideal lecturer, spoke without preparation, being full of his subject. It invested his spoken

words with that spontaneity and *entrain* which makes his prose writings so readable.

In 1870, during a flying visit to England, he began his connection with the *Daily News*, then edited by Frank Harrison Hill and managed by John R. Robinson, whom he regards as "the ideal of a successful newspaper manager." Nothing, Victor Hugo says, succeeds like success, and the successful way in which Robinson exploited the Franco-German War in the interests of his paper floated it and its manager into transient popularity and profit.

America greatly impressed and attracted Mr. McCarthy. "I had always felt myself strongly drawn towards the United States and its people," he writes, "partly because of America's splendid irruption into history and partly because it had been for so long a time the chosen home of every Irishman who suffered from unjust laws and disheartening conditions in his native land. Everywhere I went I met some Irishman and woman, whom I had known in the old country, and who did not regard themselves as foreigners in America, but were heart and soul in sympathy with its institutions, its people and its progress. For a time I often regarded it as an open question whether I should or should not follow the example of my brother and make my home in the United States, and this consideration in itself made me feel a quicker and deeper interest in every illustration of American life and growth. I received many kindly and pressing invitations to remain in America and to continue my connection with literature and journalism, and the invitations had much to recommend them and seemed to promise a satisfactory career. I remember that one warm-hearted American friend offered to present me with a new house and a large piece of ground in the near neighborhood of New York as a gift to me and my heirs forever, if I would settle down there and become a naturalized citizen of the United States."

But America was not to be his abiding place. He dreamed such a dream as O'Connell dreamt when Ireland wanted him. The call of the desert was not more alluring to Orientalists than the call of the homeland to the self-exiled Irishman. Butt had started the Home Rule movement, but though he placed the Irish demand on a lower plane than Grattan or O'Connell—as some think unwisely abandoning the strong constitutional vantage ground of the Repealers—he revived the still unsolved question of Irish autonomy and brought it within the domain of practical politics. It decided Justin McCarthy to return, in the belief that the period was coming when an Irishman devoted to the maintenance of

Ireland's national claims could probably serve his country better in London than in New York.

Back in London, while engaged in the gallery as writer of the Parliamentary leader for the *Daily News*, and working assiduously as a novelist—a denizen of what he describes as the Bohemia of Fitzroy Square—a quarter inhabited by literary men, artists and rising politicians—he began to take a closer and deeper interest in politics, speaking at political meetings and taking part in associations for the promotion of the Irish national cause. One of his near neighbors at that time was a young man whose name became famous throughout the civilized world—Charles Stuart Parnell. "I first came to know him," he relates, "because we were both members of an association of London Irishmen, banded together for the spread of the Irish national cause. My home was then in Gower street,⁵ and Parnell lived in one of the streets leading out of it. He used to come to my house very often, and we had long talks over political affairs. One of Parnell's sisters was greatly devoted to painting, and Parnell, though not much of an artist in the ordinary sense, took a kindly interest in my daughter's early studies at the Slade School. He was a very young man then, and indeed his whole life did not last beyond middle age. He was very tall, very handsome, with finely moulded delicate features. His eyes were especially remarkable. I have not seen others like them. Their light was peculiarly penetrating, and, to use a somewhat phrase, magnetic. His manners in private life were singularly sweet and winning, and in the company of his friends he was both humorous and witty. His influence over me and his advice began to give, more and more, a distinctly political turn to my career. He had already begun to make himself a most conspicuous figure in the House of Commons; but as yet there were very few who could foresee the high and unique position which he was destined to hold as a political leader."

Meanwhile this political train of thought found a literary outlet in his *History of Our Own Times*, a book which, written in a popular style, has attained wide circulation and earned for its author the reputation and rank of an historian. It grew out of the idea of writing a history of the English Radical party, a plan expanded, at the suggestion of a London publisher, into a *History of the Reign of Queen Victoria*. While he was writing it the publishers became alarmed for the success of the undertaking, when it became known that he had been invited to join the Irish party. The contract was by mutual consent annulled, and Chatto & Windus became the publishers of what was farther developed into a *History of Our Own*

⁵ 48 Gower street.

Times. The publication of the first and second volumes marked a distinct epoch in his literary career. He says in passing that his career as journalist, novelist and historian, depending for success upon the English public, might well have been regarded as hampered from the beginning by the fact that he was an Irishman, a Catholic and a Home Ruler; "but," he adds, "I have never found these facts interfere in the slightest degree with the fair reception of my books by English critics and English readers." The *History of Our Own Times* is, to use an Americanism, a little too previous. That history still remains to be written. It has been well said that the history of which we know least is the history of the times in which we live; and readers of another generation will have to wait until some future investigator, working on the lines laid by the late W. J. Fitzpatrick, gives to the world *Secret Service Under Victoria* and some other gossiping Greville lifts the official veil that hides the deliberations of the Privy Council from the knowledge of outsiders. Pending the publication of a history based on first-hand acquaintance with the secret springs which set in motion the complex machinery of statecraft, it is well to have an interesting compilation from the papers of the period, with a more or less illuminative running commentary by a journalist and politician of ripe experience. The best thing he has done in the way of historical writing is, perhaps, his admirable monograph on *Leo XIII.*, a study of the leading events of that momentous pontificate.

In 1879 he plunged boldly into the political current, became M. P. for Longford, and made his maiden speech in the House on a motion by Shaw Lefevre calling for some reform in the oppressive system of land tenure in Ireland. He amusingly describes how he felt "miserably and abjectly nervous" while waiting for his opportunity to rise and catch the speaker's eye. He says: "It is not too much to say that I positively did not know what I was saying and derived my main courage from my knowledge that I could somehow manage to make an extemporaneous speech of moderate length without committing myself to any utter absurdity."

It should be noted here that Justin McCarthy first entered Parliament as a Liberal; *à fond*, he was a Liberal all through and to the end. He made a certain sacrifice in joining the Irish party, but he made it willingly. At that time Irish nationalism was tabooed in London society, in the clubs, in every political and social circle where dominant unionism held sway. It meant social ostracism for a man of any standing in the political or literary world to touch it. Justin McCarthy not only touched it, but he clasped it to his bosom as the only thing that held forth any hope or prospect of

Ireland's regeneration. He lived to see a great change; to see the tables turned; to see nationalism recognized as an organized political force; to see unionism lose its hold and nationalism become the prime factor in the estimation of British statesmen like Gladstone, Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith.

Looking back over the busy years inside and outside Parliament that have lapsed since then, he says: "I always loved the life of the House of Commons. I went through years and years of the most exacting and the most exhaustive Parliamentary struggles. I took part in all the obstruction movements which spread through so many sessions. I had often during the session to turn night into day and day into night; to go home after the sun had risen over that Westminster scene which Wordsworth has depicted. I can remember once having had to spend three days in the House without ever leaving its precincts; and I can honestly say that I found enjoyment in the life of the House of Commons. Moreover, while I was thus striving to discharge my Parliamentary duties, I had all the time to work for a living by the writing of books and newspaper articles."

His wife's^a death in 1881 caused a break in this strenuous life. It led to his making a protracted tour through Holland, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Austria, Greece, Constantinople, Egypt, the Holy Land and Italy. It bore literary fruit in a novel entitled *Maid of Athens*. He projected two other novels dealing with the East, but they never saw the light. Upon his return to London he settled down for several years in a house in Cheyne Gardens, Chelsea, not far from Carlyle's house in Cheyne row. His growing reputation brought him more and more into association with men who bore names eminent in politics, science, literature and art. In politics Mr. McCarthy has always managed to steer an even keel. A level-headed Irishman who does not talk sunburstery or *raimeis*—he has made himself *persona grata* to men of various views, even views diametrically opposite to his. He thus defines his political creed: "Unlike many of my colleagues, I had always felt a profound respect for the constitution and the history of the House of Commons. To some of my friends in the Irish party the House of Commons was merely one of the weapons of tyrannical oppression by which England was enabled to keep Ireland in servitude. It seemed to them only a part of the enemy's war machinery, and every course of action which could enfeeble it and render it helpless and even ridiculous was to them always deserving of sympathy and applause. I could not look at things from this point of view. I had always regarded the House of Commons, whatever might

^a Née Charlotte Allman, a member of a well-known Cork family.

have been its defects and its shortcomings, as a powerful agency in the development of constitutional and religious equality, and my main desire in public life was to see the establishment of such an institution in Ireland for the government of the Irish people by the Irish people. The possibility of Ireland becoming a thoroughly independent State and self-ruling republic, let us say, lying close to the shores of Great Britain, seemed to me to be so far outside the range of human vision as not to call for serious consideration in days like ours. If the world ever becomes so enlightened and civilized that small countries like Ireland are allowed, without let or hindrance from great and powerful neighboring States, then indeed I admit that patriotic Irishmen might well give themselves hope of the effort for Ireland's absolute independence. But I could not see any prospect of such a condition in human affairs, and I should have been content with a compromise which should give Ireland the entire management and control of her own legislation, while she yet remains a member of the British Imperial system."

Ireland was in the throes of a revolution after Mr. McCarthy returned to London. Poulet Scrope once described the country in the state of chronic unrest produced by the operation of a land code, enacted in the interests of a class and not of the people at large, as being in a condition of "suppressed civil war." It was no longer suppressed. The land war which has destroyed feudalism in Ireland had broken out, to end in the transference of the soil from the landlords to the tenantry by process of law, a process for the moment arrested by the hanging up of land purchase. By a strange freak of fate this scholarly, thoughtful journalist and man of letters was thrown into the thick of the fight. The duty was imposed on him of attending large public meetings in Ireland in support of the Nationalist candidates at bye-elections and assisting in the formation of new branches of the National League, addressing audiences in his native city of Cork, Waterford, Belfast and Derry. He was present at the unveiling of the O'Connell monument in Dublin, an incident which recalled to his memory **the one occasion** upon which he had heard the Liberator speak, namely, when, seated, owing to the already enfeebled state of his health, he addressed the pupils of the Catholic schools in Cork. Mr. McCarthy, in his cheery way, calls this busy time a holiday. "I have always looked back upon that holiday spent in my native country," he says, "as one of the bright chapters of my life." Another holiday, a long-contemplated visit to Spain, was cut short by his urgent recall to Ireland where more meetings were being held and where, at a convention, he was to lend his voice in deciding upon the course

the Irish party was to pursue with regard to the land question generally and certain land measures before Parliament. This was the last of what he calls his "holiday trips."

He was now in the front rank of the fighting force that Parnell had marshaled under the Home Rule banner. In the general election of 1885 he made an unsuccessful effort to win the blue ribbon of the Irish party, the representation of Londonderry, or, as it is usually called, Derry, which he twice contested. Defeated first by a majority of 29 and secondly by a majority of 3, he was on his way to America in 1886, when he received the gladdening news that he was at last the Nationalist member for the Maiden City. Simultaneously reëlected for Longford, he elected to sit for Derry. Some years later he stood again for Derry, but was defeated, when his Longford constituents reëlected him.

They were stirring and stormy times. Ireland was a seething sea of agitation; but he kept his head cool in the midst of all the feverish ferments. When the Phoenix Park murders threatened to wreck the whole movement and anti-Irish feeling in England was stirred to its deepest depths by the assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke, the permanent Under Secretary, Justin McCarthy and Parnell called on Mr. Chamberlain to consult him as to the best steps which the Irish party should take to repudiate in the most effective manner on behalf of Ireland any national sympathy with that utterly detestable crime, which was the deadliest blow ever aimed at the Irish cause or at the conciliatory policy of the great English Minister who then held office. But by a strong fatality, not without its parallel in Irish history, it was destined to receive another blow, not from the hand of an enemy, but from one who was himself the greatest personification of the Irish National Idea since Owen Roe O'Neill.

After a lecturing tour in the United States, Mr. McCarthy once more returned to London on the eve of the Parnell Commission. Of the sinister figure in that legal drama whose self-destruction in Madrid, whither he fled, a fugitive from justice, was to invest it with such a tragic interest, Justin McCarthy says: "I never, to my knowledge, saw Richard Pigott, the man who concocted the forged letters, although in his evidence before the Special Commission he deposed that he had one secret interview with me." During the earlier months of its progress he daily attended the commission, being then vice chairman of the Irish party. His attendance was interrupted by an interval of several weeks, during which he made a trip to Algeria, to which his son, who had been elected M. P. for Newry, was ordered by the doctors for the benefit of his health.

Upon the death of John Bright on March 26, 1889, it fell to Mr. McCarthy's lot to voice the feelings of those who sat upon the Irish benches towards one who had formerly pleaded so eloquently the cause of Ireland, but who subsequently sided with those dissentient Liberals who opposed Gladstone's Home Rule policy. He acquitted himself of the task with his habitual tact and paid a well-merited tribute to the distinguished statesman, of whom he could speak from personal knowledge, having been so closely associated with him during his editorship of the *Star*.

Of the climax of the Parnell Commission, when the great Irishman, upon whom the eyes of the political world were riveted, passed through the fiery ordeal unscathed and came forth the man and the hero of the hour, and the anti-climax when the nation's idol was, by his own act, displaced from the lofty pedestal he occupied, Justin McCarthy rightly says: "If the career of Charles Stuart Parnell had come to a close after the memorable scene in the House of Commons when Liberals and Conservatives and Irish members sprang to their feet to welcome him, it would have been better for his own fame and for the cause of his country."

When the stormy debate took place in committee room 15 it was Justin McCarthy who headed the secessionists, whose abandonment of "the Chief" split the party into two sections—Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites. It was a fateful parting of the ways. The "split" broke up the unity which was the party's source of strength, and many a day was to pass and many conflicts were to be waged before the open wound, which sapped the vitality and vigor of the national movement, was healed. After the abortive Boulogne negotiations Mr. McCarthy reluctantly accepted the chairmanship. "To hold such a position at such a time," he says, "threatened a most serious inroad on that literary work which was my chief enjoyment and my only means of making a living. It was a cruel stroke of fate which compelled me to stand forth as the political opponent of Parnell, to whom, as a leader, I had long been most sincerely devoted, and with whom I had had many years of intimate and steady friendship." It placed him in a self-contradictory position, for at the Leinster Hall meeting in Dublin, followed by the hasty and unanimous reëlection of Parnell, he had spoken of the danger of changing horses when crossing a stream, and even Mr. T. M. Healy, who, in the sequel, became so virulent an opponent of the man who had discovered and found a sphere for his political genius, warned them not to interfere with "the man at the wheel." But consistency and gratitude are negligible quantities in politics, and Parnell had to pay the penalty for a social offense which made him impossible as the representative of a Catholic nation and an

embarrassment to politicians who could not dispense with the English Liberal party, dominated by Gladstone, "the greatest Parliamentary figure since the history of Parliament," as Mr. A. J. Balfour declared.

The anti-Parnellites made what they fondly hoped would be their first great demonstration in the city of Cork. The time and place were ill chosen. It only showed what a grasp Parnell's powerful personality had on the country. It fell to Justin McCarthy to revisit his native place under strangely altered conditions. His heart sank at the thought of having to become an object of dislike and hostility to so many of his fellow-citizens, for Cork, he admits, harbored a very strong contingent of Parnellites. It would be more correct to say that the majority of the warm-hearted and impulsive people of the chief city of Munster were Parnellites to a man. When he reached the Cork terminus he was groaned at and hooted and a shower of stones fell on the omnibus which conveyed him to his hotel. One of the priest who accompanied him earnestly urged him to wrap a large cloak or plaid round his head. "I could not," he says, "reconcile my mind to the idea of the new leader of the Irish National party making his undignified way through the streets with a protecting cloak wrapped round his head and shoulders. The Spartan borne on his shield might be regarded as a picturesque and heroic spectacle, but the Spartan with his head muffled in a cloak would be but a sorry and grotesque sight." At a packed public meeting a well-known Corkman was making a speech, and in the course of it expressed his regret at having to oppose Parnell, as he much admired him and had known him for many years. "I knew him," he said, "since he was in petticoats." "Ah!" whispered a ready-witted colleague to a friend on the platform, "it would have been well if he let them alone after that." On his departure the railway platform was practically in police occupation, the approaches to the terminus being strongly guarded by constabulary. Notwithstanding this clash of parties in hot conflict, Justin McCarthy and Parnell remained firm friends, and some astonishment was created in Palace Yard when they both drove up in the same hansom to the members' entrance to the House of Commons. It was the talk of the lobby for hours. By a singular coincidence he read of Parnell's death on the same day that he learned that Sir John Pope Hennessy, his friend from boyhood's days, was no more.

After the general election of 1892 Mr. McCarthy led a party of seventy-two, while the Parnellites only numbered nine, figures which at present tally with the relative numerical strength of the party now led by Mr. John Redmond and the followers of Mr. William O'Brien. He had accepted the leadership because he

thought that, under all the conditions, there was nothing better to be done for the interests of the party and the cause, but had made up his mind from the beginning not to retain it after the party should settle down and there should seem to be good hopes of a complete reunion and reconstruction. It so happened that he became involved in large pecuniary liabilities through the financial failure of an exhibition of Irish industrial products in London, which made it incumbent on him to devote more attention to his literary work. He therefore resigned the chairmanship of the party in favor of Mr. John Dillon, without, however, vacating his seat or ceasing to give his regular attendance at the House of Commons.

About this time he received a very pressing invitation and tempting off to lecture in Australia, but was unable to enter into such a long engagement as it would necessitate.

On the 1st of March Gladstone delivered his last speech in the House of Commons, and four days afterwards, on March 5, Mr. McCarthy had his last interview with the great English statesman, who, solely by his personal prestige and influence, revolutionized the policy of Great Britain towards Ireland. He assured the quondam leader of the Irish party, with all the emphasis so characteristic of him when he felt deeply on any question, that he was thoroughly devoted to the cause of Home Rule for Ireland and perfectly satisfied in his own mind that the Home Rule cause was destined to come, and before long, to a triumphant issue. He spoke of Parnell in language of generous appreciation, and expressed his profound regret that so really great a career should have come to so sudden and disastrous an end.

The last speech Mr. McCarthy himself made in Parliament on any subject of importance was when it was proposed to erect a statue to Oliver Cromwell within the precincts of Westminster Palace, against which he raised his voice in opposition. He felt as most Irishmen feel. Ireland suffered too much from the ruthless rigor of Cromwell's rule, to which the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford bear witness, for Irishmen, who have long memories, to take an impartial view of the Protector's place and part in history; to recognize that, apart from his ferocious fanaticism, he was the first in modern times to successfully resist the arbitrary exercise of the royal prerogative and to maintain the sovereignty of Parliament.

After bringing out in April, 1897, the fifth volume of his *History of Our Own Times*, Mr. McCarthy was stricken with a serious illness through the strain of overwork. He lay for a long time wholly unconscious, and even when the worst was over was still for some weeks not quite sure of his own identity or of those who came around him. In July of that year he moved to Westgate-

on-Sea. From his earliest years he suffered extremely from short sight, and during his working years as author, journalist and politician he remorselessly overtaxed his vision, to the extent that he had to undergo some critical operations. But before long the healthful qualities of the bracing atmosphere of the seaside resort had such an invigorating effect that he was able to resume his literary work with the aid of a professional typewriter. One of the first products of his returning health was the publication of his *Reminiscences*. Soon afterwards he contributed two volumes to Fisher Unwin's *Story of the Nations* series: *Modern England Before the Reform Bill* and *Modern England From the Reform Bill to the Present Time* (1899). He worked under peculiar difficulties. He could read nothing himself, and whatever he wished to learn from books or newspapers had to be read to him. He felt rather proud of the fact that he was able, once he began to recover health, to keep in touch with the passing story of the world. Needless to say that he continued to follow with close and unflinching attention, from day to day, every phase of the Irish national movement. Some of his quondam political colleagues and London journalists would come down occasionally and help to enliven his retreat, to keep him *au courant* of passing events. The quiet seaside village, which he first looked upon as a temporary refuge, became his abiding place for the rest of his days.

An indefatigable penman, his pen was never idle. Even advancing years and failing health and eyesight, which would have impressed on many the need of well-earned repose, after a hard working life, did not cause him to lay his work aside. He may be said to have died in literary harness, for within a few months before his death he revised his *Irish Reminiscences*, to which he had just time to put the final finishing touches. It must have been a sort of sad pleasure to him to recall the vanished past and, as it were, bask in the light of other days, "the days that are no more." It was characteristic of one who cherished a love of the old land, of old places, old times and old friends, as evident from those *Reminiscences*, where the personal note is obvious without being obtrusive, where it gives a realistic vividness to the narrative without revealing any trace of the egotistic.

It was at Westgate he finished his *History of the Four Georges* (1884-1891) and wrote three novels in collaboration with Mrs. Campbell-Praed, the only volumes produced by literary coöperation. His *Reign of Queen Anne* came out in 1902, and a small volume, *Ireland and Her Story* for the *Story of the Empire Series*. Then was issued *British Political Leaders*, a collection in book form of a number of articles which had originally appeared in *The Outlook*,

a New York publication. His later works included *Portraits of the Sixties*, to illustrate Fisher Unwin's valuable collection of photographs, and an Irish novel, *Mononia*, a Munster story, the plot of which was laid in his native Cork, and which first ran through the *Weekly Freeman*. This novel, he frankly admits, never became popular, although it was grounded on the stirring events of '48 and the Young Ireland Movement, which, one would imagine, should have ensured it a good reception at the hands of Irish readers; but it has often hitherto been noted that Ireland is a nation *incuriosa suorum*. Let us hope that Home Rule will change all that and stimulate an intelligent interest in everything Irish, particularly the Irish language, music, art and literature. Into *Mononia* (the ancient name of Munster), *My Enemy's Daughter* and *Dear Lady Disdain* he put a good deal of his early life and its local associations. Of the first named he says: "I felt in writing it as I were offering a tribute to the memory of the dead and a message of encouragement to the living national cause." Novel followed novel in rapid succession from his prolific pen, while to the leading reviews he frequently contributed articles on various topics. A complete bibliography of his writings would fill several pages of this magazine.

A consensus of opinion amongst the most discerning has assigned to Justin McCarthy a position among novelists of the Victorian epoch next to and not far below Anthony Trollope, Mrs. Henry Wood and other writers of that school who sought to faithfully depict the social life of the nineteenth century. It is not to be expected that one who writes very much and very frequently will endow literature with a classic. The output of novels from the presses of Great Britain during the last half a century has been enormous and bewildering. It may safely be averred that very few of them will live in English literature as standard works fit to take their places alongside those of Thackeray, Dickens and George Eliot. Perhaps some of those by Blackmore, George Meredith and a few others may be found among the survival of the fittest, which shall have escaped the oblivion that inevitably awaits the too ready writer.

Justin McCarthy's writing, lucid, limpid and fluent, free from any *enflure* or those meretricious tricks of style or what passes for it, mannerism, affected by inferior authors, has been much admired by all who relish good English. It is a well-poised style which, if it never soars high, seldom sinks low, and, though familiar and conversational, is not commonplace. If it does not captivate us by its brilliancy, impress us with the sense of strength, of something vigorous and virile, it never suggests bathos or *orbanalité*. The

influence of Cobden and Bright, consummate masters of homely English, pure and undefiled by foreign neologisms, with whom he was so much brought in contact when he edited the *Morning Star*, is clearly traceable therein.

Journalism was his first literary love; early wedded to it, he never divorced himself from it. Except during the months of his complete breakdown, for a long time he never ceased to contribute a monthly article to the *New York Independent*. "My dealings with American publishers," he says, "have always been most satisfactory, and I have none but the most genial memories of the lengthened visits which I was happily able to pass to the great city on the Hudson River where so many bright days of my life were passed."

His Parliamentary career came to a nend with the general election of 1890, when he did not seek reëlection for Longford. "I hope I am not to be considered too egotistical," he writes, "when I say that it must ever be to me the brightest memory of my working lifetime that I was able to give twenty-one years of continuous service, such as it was, to the cause of Ireland, that I feel a pride in having been so long a member of the House of Commons, and that my feeling of personal pride was not lessened by the fact that I had gained nothing in the worldly sense, but, on the contrary, had lost much by turning from the quiet paths of literature into the excitement and exhaustion of political and Parliamentary warfare."

In 1903 he was made the recipient of a civil list pension for his services to English literature. His long residence in England, where he was as much esteemed as among his own countrymen, never caused his sound and enlightened patriotism to moult a feather. He never degenerated into that hybrid, that mentally self-expatriated Irishman, a West Briton. From his retreat on the southern coast of England he wrote: "I remain a quiet observer of the active world and its movements. From this uneventful place of observation I have seen with intense satisfaction the Irish National party becoming more and more thoroughly united in the maintenance of the Irish cause and its methods of action towards that end. I feel, too, an increasing pride and pleasure in the spread of the national spirit throughout Ireland, and in that one of its later developments which strives, with a continually growing success, for the revival of that ancient language and literature which seemed to belong to the very atmosphere of Ireland and to be as much a part of her characteristic life as her mountains, her lakes, her green valleys and her rushing rivers."

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

THE OBLIGATION AND THE SANCTION OF THE MORAL LAW.

IN THE fullest sense of the word, the sanction of the law would be the inner sacredness of its character which makes it good, obligatory,¹ imperative, self-vindicating in its consequences and demanding vindication from its guardian. As a matter of usage, sanction often stands only for the externally added rewards and punishments—especially the latter; and to some extent this limitation is a pity, for it is easily mutilated into a doctrine supporting the view which sees virtue subordinated as a means to gain pleasure and escape pain. Even Christian writers incline at times to speak imprudently on this point, when they really mean nothing injurious, as when Dr. Gutberlet lays it down, in his "Christian Ethics," that the worth of a moral act is estimated in reference to the infinite good, but obligation in reference to happiness: "Der Wert in Beziehung zum unendlichen Gute, die Verpflichtung in die Beziehung zur Glückseligkeit."² More accurately, worth is also estimated in its own immediate character and its own power, apart from retribution, to found an obligation, while happiness as such is not primary in imposing obligation. Paley also lays too much stress upon obligation as a kind of "violence" which "is ultimately reducible to the expectation of being rewarded or punished as a result of the divine command. This solution goes to the bottom of the subject, as no further question can reasonably be asked."³ Here the writer ignores the constraint of virtue for virtue's sake, when its exercise becomes imperative as a matter of rational conduct.

More naturally in an empiricist like Bain, whose view is quite intra-mundane, we expect his language to have resemblance to the illustrations just adduced. He says: "I have given it as my deliberate opinion that authority or punishment is the commencement of the state of mind recognized under the various names of conscience, moral sense, the sentiment of obligation."⁴ And again:

¹ Given the recognition of right and wrong and given that God always forbids wrong and often enjoins right, we have a rational account of obligation which disproves the elaborate contention of M. Charmon in his "Renaissance de Droit Naturel," that only by a faith can we be assured that obligation is a reality. Moral good beyond obligation, when denied by determinists, has little meaning, for they hold that each character inevitably acts up to its own best in given circumstances, and so practically cannot come across the question of supererogation.

² "Ethick und Religion," s. 221.

³ "Moral Philosophy," Book II. *in initio*: "To be obliged is to be urged by a violent motive resulting from the command of another who, in case of disobedience, can disturb our happiness."

⁴ "The Emotions and the Will," Chap. X, n. 7.

"Whenever an action is associated with disapprobation and punishment, there grows up in reference to it a state of mind undistinguished from the moral sentiment."⁵ Bain, speaking from the legal standpoint, naturally tends to identify responsibility with punishability, for the civil law rather punishes than rewards: "Morality is not prudence, nor benevolence in their primitive spontaneous manifestations; it is the systematic codification of prudential and benevolent actions rendered obligatory by what is termed penalties or punishment; an entirely distinct motive, artificially formed by human society, but made so familiar to every member of society as to be a second nature."⁶ For the agnostic writer, of course, human society furnishes by its retributions the highest sanction that he recognizes, as utility for human welfare is his highest ethical standard.

We could not argue exclusively from the fact of insistence being laid by the same author chiefly on punishment that by him no higher consideration was admitted. Cardinal Newman in his earlier writings had greatly emphasized the terrors of conscience as witnessing to the existence of that stern monitor, and the fact was alleged against him, especially by Mr. Edwin Abbott in his hostile "*Philomythus*," as showing much unloveliness in Newman's ideas of the religious mind. It is likely that early training of a Puritan sort had given a severe tone to Newman's character. But in the "*Grammar of Assent*" he took occasion to refute the not wholly gratuitous charge against him by adding a fuller account of the witness which conscience bears as well for as against man. He was no Horace to say, "We believe Jupiter when he thunders," but not when his heavens are serene. Certainly he had full sympathy for a free service of God apart from outer constraints, and it was in this spirit that he liked St. Philip's oratory, which kept its members together without vows, while he would not have denied the worth of the religious vows from its own point of view. Strict rules as to fast-days and their manner of observance are good; some in the freedom of their spirit may do more when left to their own generosity. Newman had a mind wide enough to see the value of law, penalty and terror without being blind to spontaneity, virtue for virtue's sake and love.

II.

Bain's idea that obligation means liability to punishment is not wholly untrue to the method by which children are slowly educated into moral perceptiveness: "Go, nurse, and see what Tommy is

⁵ "*Moral Science*," Chap. II., n. 8.

⁶ "*Ethics*," Part I., Chap. III., n. 10.

doing, and tell him not to do it," is the caricature. As a plain fact, children find that good things are given to them for being what is called good and bad things for being what is called bad, and it is the latter treatment that specially impresses them with a sense of obligation. They are little utilitarians, as they must be to start with, before they can apprehend right and wrong in the moral sense. Even Rousseau could not have hoped to start his rational education at the stage of infancy; he could not have given to the baby the reasons for proper conduct. Mere drill precedes as a sort of mechanical introduction to truly ethical instruction and habituation. The life which at first is largely on the sensitive level must gradually rise to the spiritual. Aristotle insists much on habituation before rational explanation, at least upon the philosophic level, can profitably be given. But it is a mistaken doctrine of evolution that sees in the higher man only a more elaborate development of the lower animal; the description which stands more or less in common to the puppy dog and to the small child neglects the underlying difference which is one of kind and not simply of degree. M. Solomon Reinach in his introduction to "*Cultes, Mythes et Religions*," denies that among rude peoples obligation is merely imposed from without; even among these there is, he maintains, an inner constraint of morality and religion arising in man's rational nature and issuing in certain prohibitions and commands. If he allows the term "sanction" to go over to the meaning of enforcement by penalties and rewards, he would keep the term "obligation" for a more intrinsic significance, even among what are called "primitive peoples." "Assui loin que nous remontions dans le cours des âges, l'homme subit, à côté des contraintes extérieures, une contrainte intérieure. Il n'éprouve pas seulement des résistances, mais il s'en crée à lui-même, sous la forme de craintes et des scrupules. Ces craintes et ces scrupules ont pris, avec le temps, des noms différents; ce sont les lois morales, les lois politiques, les lois religieuses. Aujourd'hui ces trois sortes de lois subsistent et exercent leur action restrictive sur l'énergie humaine; elles existent de même chez les sauvages des temps les plus reculés, mais à l'état confus et pour ainsi dire, indivis." Not all taboos are moral, but some of them

⁷ Naturalists say of bodily organisms that wonderful as is the complexity of the highest over the lowest, yet that close inspection shows the main principles to be in common. So it is in the morality of men at different stages of culture. Westermarck is not singular in his conclusion "that when we examine the moral rules of uncivilized people we find that in a very large measure they resemble those prevalent among cultured nations" as to homicide, theft, mutual aid, truthfulness, property, etc., not, of course, without important differences. The like is the testimony of Mr. L. T. Hobhouse: "The comparative study of ethics, which is apt at earlier stages to impress the student with a bewilderment, ends rather by impressing him with a more fundamental and far-reaching uniformity." ("*Morals in Evolution*," Vol. I., p. 32.) Another analogy between organic and moral development is that many low types are traceable to degeneration.

distinctly are so and have come from a conscientious perception that the objects were ethically bad. There is possible a reasoned classified account of these moral taboos which reaches above Mr. Hobhouse's account of them as being generally resolvable into the more precise question: What will befall a man if he ignore the obligation?⁸ It is quite unfair in theorists to limit the mind of uncultivated races by their self-willed analysis of what they call primitive ideas.

III.

Having from one aspect regretted that so sacred a term as sanction has been often limited to rewards and punishments and has been supposed on this interpretation to carry with it the special force of obligation, we may next with safety make some defense of these outer constraints which in its narrower sense it signifies, while we protest against certain theories of an opposite tendency. It is not true that virtue is spoilt by any regard to consequences in the shape of awards made to it on the score of desert. Such recompense, being eminently in the rational order, should be approved. It is generous at times to forego the rewards; it is always noble to esteem virtue for virtue's sake. Moreover, we must not forget that some of the sanctions have intrinsically an ethical value of their own. The belief in the continuance of the good life hereafter is very distinctly a moralizing element, because it declares that the exercise of good conduct is not ephemeral, not a mere flux of admirable events that have no lasting excellence, but vanish at death like a show of fireworks. It is a great slur on human dignity if no noble character is individually to have permanence beyond the few years of mortal life. This truth is to some extent acknowledged by one whose own beliefs are confessedly not assured. He says:⁹ "I can lay claim to no religious convictions; I am not aware of any strong desire for any continuance of my personality, and I could accept with equanimity a thoroughgoing materialism, if that seemed to me the inevitable outcome of a dispassionate and critical reflection. Nevertheless, I am in sympathy with the religious attitude towards life, and I should welcome the establishment, on sure empirical foundation, of the belief that human personality is not wholly destroyed by death." After this he adds a remark specially valuable for our present purpose: "Apart from any hope of reward or fear of punishments, the belief in future life must have, it seems to me, a moralizing influence upon our thought and conduct which we can

⁸ "Morals in Evolution," Vol. II., 220.

⁹ "Body and Mind," by G. McDougall, Preface, p. xiii.

ill afford to dispense with."¹⁰ Really we could not have a very grand idea of human morality if we were convinced that it had not in it any individual duration longer than the material health of the brain, if it were perishable as is the earthly organism. It is only by exaggerating one general aspect—the aspect of self-sacrifice—that the contrary can be pretended. Self-sacrifice is noble, but only in a limited way; it cannot stand as all-in-all, nor is it present in every good action; it must give way before a higher aspect. In God as such it is impossible; in man it must never do away with marked love of self. How could we be urged to the perfection of charity in loving our neighbors as ourselves if it were best to have no desire for all conservation of self?

Therefore, the professors of independent ethics are apt to leave solid truth for rhetoric or for the purpose of making the best of a bad job in their own philosophy, in which happiness beyond the grave has been despaired of because of the personal extinction expected after death. Then they were as eloquent as they can find words to be over yielding up life in a good cause without prospect of reaping any advantage to themselves. Here is an example: "Let me say distinctly at the outset that the ideal view of morality with which I am now concerned does not rest upon idealism in philosophy. There is no reason why the philosophical materialist should not join me in what I shall say of morality. As a matter of fact, there seems to be as much moral idealism among those who call themselves materialists as among any other class of people. Think for a moment of the revolutionists in Russia, most of them young men and women, of whom it is said that you could not offer them a greater affront than to call them idealists. They are materialists; they do not believe in God or a future life; the world of the senses is alone real for them. Yet where do they place their hope? In something they do not see, in something that has never been, for Russia—an era of freedom, an era of democracy, an era of brotherhood. And for that possibility, for that idea, they leave sometimes high rank and station, become ascetics in their mode of life and are ready to go to Siberia or the scaffold."¹¹

No doubt here there is in its own order some brave spirit of self-sacrifice; but we must remember that this rhetorician also depreciates scornfully the personal self to exalt an impersonal ideal of morality, for which not even a God is given as the approver;

¹⁰ In a Persian story we read that an official said to a Sultan in Egypt: "Night and day I am occupied in the service of my master, hoping reward from his liberality and dreading punishment from his displeasure." The Sultan wept and said: "If I had been to Allah as thou to thy master, by this time I should have been high among the elect."

¹¹ "Ethical Religion," by W. M. Salter, p. 20.

it is a mere ideal, with no claim to foundation in any personal divinity. It is cut off from all personal interests as such; morality in ultimate analysis is not for persons, but persons for morality. The question is whether men are first capable, and then rightly capable of such utterly unselfish admiration; also whether theists can love God utterly unmoved by personal fears and hopes, because it is good and has an intense charm for them;¹² and, furthermore, whether a rational self-interest, if it is possible and even permissible, is, at any rate, a diminution of virtue and deserving of the name which has been fixed upon it, "unmasculine."

As regards the incidental difficulty against the personality of the legislator, if this term essentially included shape, and limit, and body and similar characters found in all persons known to our experience as earthly, then to rest the ideal law of morality on such a person would seem to subordinate the law to the law-bound observer who is not a law to himself, but is subordinable under a nondescript superself. Such superself cannot be. Morality must look for its origin to God, with the result of personal immortality in blissfulness for men who keep His ordinances. To make the ultimate basis an impersonal rule based upon no concrete reality gives opportunity for rhetorical flights about personal self-sacrifice, but argues no solid ground for heroism. The ultimate good in ethics cannot be an abstraction. One more specimen we will add of the turgid rhetoric which refutes itself by its visible flabbiness: "Self, purged of egoism, seeks its own best through dedication. We do not ask for crowns and thrones in the next world; we do not ask for compensation which will make earth's trials insignificant. Face to face with death, even the death of those whose love was unspeakably precious, we do not passionately demand again our darlings or cling with tremulous persistence to a promise of immortality. Now, as formerly, the continuance of the individual after death remains a matter for hope and faith. Science as yet can neither affirm nor deny life beyond the grave."¹³

IV.

To the consideration that the sanction hereafter attached as reward to a good life on earth is a state which has, in the wider sense of the term, moral¹⁴ worth of its own, being the service of

¹² *L. c.*, p. 16.

¹³ "Essays, Speculative and Suggestive," by J. Addington Symonds.

¹⁴ By a narrower definition the moral is what is free and meritorious, during the probationary course only. And as another matter of definition some call sanction what is added over and above the natural outcome of an act, such as ill health of the glutton and good health of the temperate man.

God in a higher order, we may now add that even the penal sanction for a bad life is also moral as a deserved continuance of that life kept up by the obdurate spirit. Thus a good life on earth has its sanctioning reward in the same life lived on a higher and a blissful plane, whilst a base life on earth has its sanctioning punishment in the same life on a lower and painful plane, where the chief suffering is the *poena damni*, or loss of God's friendship and communion. The reprobate has died with his back resolutely turned upon God, and his chief punishment is to remain, under added aggravated conditions in his chosen situation of aversion from his last and beatific end. To prove that this condition can never be set right does not belong to natural ethics; for what knowledge we have of it we must depend upon revelation. The light of mere reason shows the need of penalty after death, but not the impossibility of a second probation which would be rendered practically safe by the terrible memory of the past experience. Reason does defend the justice of a punishment which is vindictive, not in the mean sense of malicious delight in another's woe,¹⁵ but in the sense that wickedness as naturally calls for a sanction in pain as does virtue for a sanction in happiness. The two diametrically opposed courses ought not in reason to lead to one and the same result, as though there were no irreconcilable difference between them. Among men penalty as vindictive—if it be supposed to exist at all—would belong to the civil state; but nowadays states mostly repudiate the intention of being more than corrective and deterrent in their punishments. God as supreme Remunerator of right and wrong cannot take up that attitude. All ages in His

¹⁵ The canonist Schmalzgrueber uses the apt phrase "*justitia vindictiva ex amore recti ordinis*"—a great contrast to the fatalistic and immoral visitation of the Athenian deities. As addressed to God, the verse is to be taken from Psalm xxvii, 9: "Give to them according as they have done, and according to the wickedness of their deeds render to them." When we express a truth by saying, God has no delight in punishing, we must avoid a modern apologetic which says that God so sympathizes with His imperfect world as positively and in His divine nature to suffer along with it, because His limited power cannot make it better. Another bad form of apologetic is to deny the real distinction between God and the suffering sinner. Of the pantheistic Schopenhauer Sir A. Lyall writes in his "Second Series of Asiatic Studies," p. 39: "Christianity, whatever may be its philosophic basis, does at least assert with an imperative mandate that is totally wanting in Brahmanism: 'Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, and I will repay it.' This is just the kind of bold, authoritative declaration that I wish the fine-drawing Hindu brain could ever be got to accept without argument or analysis. It is therefore saddening, if not maddening, to find that Schopenhauer, who is drugged with all the drowsy errors of the East, explains this text as delivered out of the deep knowledge which allows eternal justice to proceed in the sphere of the thing-in-itself, which is different from that of the phenomenon."

regard have given some recognition to expiatory suffering for crime. Plato thinks that the wrongdoer should desire thus to suffer (*Repub.* x., 613), and other Greek writers, for instance the tragedians, add the need of turning aside divine wrath. In more recent times Kant, who thinks it good for a culprit to receive a thrashing, even though he is not thereby amended, has gone so far as to say that if a state were on the point of dissolution its duty would be to execute its criminals lying under capital sentence in its jails. Always he refers punishment to the recoil of reason upon contradictor or to the vindication of law. The mention of jails would give an excellent opportunity for remonstrative argument from the side of the school most opposed to all idea of expiatory punishment in any instance whatever, for it would lead them to sound the praises of all that criminal treatment is now trying to do by way of improving upon the old brutality which aimed at heaping up pains on an ascending scale of classified offenses without regard to individual needs of regeneration. Nowadays, while it is recognized that prison life will be ineffective unless it is made disagreeable, still palliations are admitted and diseased condition of organism is distinguished from wilful perversity, so far as we can make such distinctions.

Account, too, is taken of human improvability in its complex nature. Even horses cannot indiscriminately be whipped into good behavior; still less can more highly strung or lowly strung men as regards nerves. The movement for a humane treatment of the offending members of the race is one with that which no longer allows officials in an asylum to have a Sunday's rest by going off after tying the patients in bed and putting some food within their reach; or, again, officials in hospitals to put four or five patients with different illnesses in one bed, as we read to have been done in the France of the seventeenth century, whose civilization was not below the average in Europe. To the argument drawn from all these recent ameliorations against us and in favor of those who contend for a changed doctrine as regards our expectation of divine punishments, we must oppose the different position held by God as supreme vindicator of right and wrong. St. Paul, in reference to Deuteronomy xxxii., 31, "To Me belongeth vengeance and recompense," argues (*Rom.* xii., 19; cf. *Heb.* x., 30) that his hearers should not usurp the divine office as having no right to it, and as not being able to imitate the unimpassionedness of God, who is above all vindictiveness in the malicious sense of an ill will, while he terribly avenges the cause of the poor oppressed by brutal tyrants. (*Psalms* ix. and x.)

What revelation thus declares corresponds to a generally diffused

belief of the natural reason which is so important in moral questions and which comes out when a bad philosophy does not keep it back. That representative of the worldly point of view, the weekly edition of the *Times* for December 8, 1911, says: "It is important to remember that there is no effective legislation that is not in advance of the public conscience. Argue as we will in the abstract, there lurks hidden deep in the soul of every one an instinct for retributive punishment. Even the humanitarian who inveighs loudly against our penal system will, when moved by a tale of brutal cruelty to a defenseless woman or child, thank Providence that the brute who committed the act will meet his deserts." The thought appears in the balance of the Pythagorean *antipeponthos* and in the conviction of the Greek tragedians that ill deeds ought to bring ill experience to the doer. Much error in detail may appear, but there is a sound root at the bottom of this retributive idea, at least when God is conceived as the Avenger.¹⁶

The *Times* is one typical supporter; another is Harnack, who represents a different sphere: "No reflection of the reason, no deliberation of the intelligence will ever be able to expunge from the moral ideas of mankind the conviction that injustice and sin deserve to be punished, and that wherever the just man suffers an atonement is made which puts us to shame and puzzles us. It is a conviction which is impenetrable because it comes out of those depths in which we feel ourselves to be a unity and out of the world which lies beyond the world of phenomena. Mocked and denied as though it had long perished, this truth is indestructibly preserved in the moral experience of mankind."¹⁷

To return now to obligation apart from retributive sanction, we find some writers trying to get rid of the term. M. Guyan has devised an "Esquisse d'Une Moralité sans obligation." Cotter Morison in his "Service of Man" wrote in favor of abolishing the word "responsibility." Bentham said that "ought" is a term that ought to be abolished; and especially of Aristotle the view

¹⁶ The Roman name for law without an enforcing sanction was an unperfect law. The Greek tragedians said man must meet his deserts and suffer ill for his ill deeds. The error was to exaggerate destiny and blood taint in posterity. The Christian tradition has purified the doctrine, and may properly be counted among those inheritances which Mr. and Mrs. Whetham regret to see lost in our more artificial education: "Those whose experience in life has been of simpler, more primitive type, and who, having accepted many things originally on authority, have seen no reason, as life has lengthened and experience has ripened, to question the accuracy of the empirical knowledge they received. These most valuable teachers are often shut out from office, with their accumulation of traditional wisdom and strength of intuitive morality in its simplest and most impressive forms." ("Heredity and Society," pp. 106-107.)

¹⁷ "What Is Christianity?" Chap. IX.

has been upheld that his "Ethics" are without the idea of obligation. His *to deon* is by some commentators asserted not to carry the sense of the word "duty" as we nowadays understand and glorify that term; making it our motto that "England expects every man to do his duty" and to seek it before glory or pay. It is quite true that Aristotle's analysis was defective, or we may say not definitely attempted. His want of Theism would have prevented a perfect account.

Professor J. A. Stewart, in his notes on the "Nicomachian Ethics" (I., 2, 2; III., 7, 2), quoting Grant's opinion that Aristotelian duty means what we ought to do from any motive, not necessarily a moral motive, and that often it may be æsthetic, opposes this with the assertion that *deon* was a received term with reference to moral subjects and was distinguished from *ophelimon*, *lusiteloun*, *kerdaleon*, *sumpheron*.¹⁸ Stewart, however, as to fulness of definition, allows to Grant that "the exact import of the term was not fixed, inasmuch as controversies were raised about it, as they still are to-day, one of the commonplace discussions being "whether *deon* was *sumpheron* or *kalon*." (II., 3, 4.)

It is then shown by Stewart that Aristotle grasps the idea of the moral as the conformable to the demands of man's rational nature, and as concerned with the specific good of man which is his last end. This pagan appreciation is immeasurably above that given by the French determinist, M. Bayer, when he attacks the doctrines of intention, merit, responsibility, sanction or of *a-t-il de plus puerile que de rendre un individu, quel qu'il soit, responsable de ses actes, que de blamer l'arbre chetif et de feliciter l'arbre vigoureux.*

In regard to Aristotle, then, his repeated phrases in their combination attain to the idea of duty and justify the decision given by L. J. Hobhouse¹⁹ that the denial in him of the idea of duty is "an inference extremely unfair." The case seems like that of free will. Mediæval interpreters assumed that Aristotle taught this, but when determinism came to be explicitly discussed, it was found that determinists could read the Greek in their own sense, against which the author could have made no precise provision, because the exact question had not been suggested to his mind—least of all the refinement of "soft determinism" which has been devised to escape, through a phrase, the horror of a fatalistic theory which does not allow that any single man could ever have done better or worse throughout his whole career than he has done.

It is fair to suppose that Aristotle, whose philosophy was one

¹⁸ Plato, *Repub.*, 336 D; *Charmides*, 164 B; *Xen. Mem.* I., 2, 22.

¹⁹ "Morals in Evolution," p. 80.

of keen observation, understood well enough the condition of struggling virtue among men to know that it was not a spontaneous output of a spontaneously good nature, but a labored effort to form a second nature of habit under the constraint of moral sanctions, in a double sense of the phrase as supposing the obligation arising from right order and the obligation arising from rewards and punishments, which are added to enforce right order. And thus the moral law is doubly sanctioned, first in itself as prescribing the good and proscribing the evil; secondly, in its adjuncts of prizes for the observant and penalties for the non-observant.

That obligation is imposed primarily by the nature of the virtuous act, and secondarily by pains and penalties. Ethics therefore clearly explains and establishes obligation. But note that it does so only as a *general science*, not as an *all-comprehensive science* dealing with every concrete case in complex life. As it is the error of Dr. Schiller to throw upon logic all the burden of all knowledge, so it is the error of Mr. Pritchard in a confusedly argued paper²⁰ to attack Ethics for not solving obscure cases of conscience. Ethics looks to clearly recognized duties and thence derives the generic definition of obligation. In this it succeeds. It and Logic are successful accounts of their respective spheres, but only for those who would intrude all sorts of irrelevant questions, forgetful of the maxim, "Divide et impera." Generalized philosophies are not prescriptions.

Many modern writers are working mischief by failure to recognize that of course we cannot make exact divisions between science and science, as the syllabus for an examination cannot absolutely delimit the matter to the learned. In the last case much will depend on custom; much, too, upon the *epilikia* or sweet reasonableness of examiners. Pure logic as such assumes a large area of naturally acquired acquaintance with real truth and takes its rules and its examples from the source of data. Critical or applied logic deals with the skeptically raised question about the reality of knowledge, but only in general, leaving special departments to special research, which may be indefinitely multiplied. A man may specialize on butterflies and find his work very large. So Ethics assumes certain recognized obligations to work upon for a general outline; casuistry becomes more precise; concrete conduct is still more complex. It is absurd to confuse the first with the third department.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

²⁰ *Mind*, January, 1912.

THE LAY VETO IN PAPAL ELECTIONS.

VERY few constitutional struggles in modern times have excited such world-wide interest as did the contest in England which was brought to a close last summer by the curtailment of the Lords' veto. For two years the struggle had raged fiercely in England, Scotland, Wales and one province of Ireland, while, as we may expect, wild things were often said and wild things sometimes done at the many stormy meetings held in the various constituencies. The scenes which took place at the close of the struggle must have brought a blush of shame to the brow of any one interested in the good name of the English nation. Within the Parliament itself—that sacred institution called by its admirers the mother of Parliaments—the Prime Minister was shouted down and his voice smothered by some leading members of the party which every one hitherto believed to consist entirely of “real English gentlemen.”

Still, there is no denying that all over Europe the struggle was watched with the keenest interest. The other countries were anxious to know how far England, the most conservative among nations, would unbend to the rising spirit of democracy. Even in distant America keen interest was taken in England's little domestic storm. The millions of Irish emigrants were naturally anxious to know what would be the end of the struggle on which, as every one admitted, the liberation or continued enslavement of their mother country eventually depended.

And yet what a small fraction of those onlookers were personally affected by the English House of Lords. Over four-fifths of the British Empire itself—over Australia, Canada, South Africa and the other colonies—the Lords did not possess an iota of jurisdiction. To the people of these countries it did not matter three straws if the Lords, instead of having their power curtailed, were accorded the same power in the British Isles as the Czar possesses in Russia. Giving the contest its utmost importance, it cannot be said that more than forty-five or fifty millions of people would be in any way disturbed by its result. The world at large was only interested in the same way as a man is often intensely interested by a good football match, though he does not care a jot which side wins.

But how many, we wonder, of these spectators were aware that a few short years ago, without any angry philippics, without any election brawls, without disturbing in any way the peace of a single individual, another veto, touching vitally the religious interests of three hundred million people, was completely and finally abolished after an existence of more than three hundred years?

Yet such an event actually did take place when in January, 1909, Pope Pius X. promulgated the Pontifical Decree *Commissum nobis*, in which he abolished completely and for ever the right of veto formerly possessed by the crowns of Austria, France and Spain in the election of the Supreme Pontiff. This veto of exclusion possessed by the above-mentioned powers—although in itself “a most odious institution,” as Cardinal De Bernis very properly called it—played, nevertheless, a most important part in several conclaves, and a short inquiry into its origin and working will not be devoid of interest as well as of advantage to the Catholic reader.

Writers of ecclesiastical history when treating of this subject are accustomed to distinguish the indirect veto from the direct. With the indirect or material veto we are not now concerned. It consisted merely in secret instructions given by some sovereign to one of the Cardinals composing the conclave, by which instructions he was requested to use all his personal influence to prevent the election of this or that candidate. All that was required, of course, was that he should induce more than a third of the electors to refuse their votes to the debarred candidate. This indirect veto never played an important part in Papal elections, and is only known to have been used occasionally during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The direct or formal veto, however—the one of which we are treating—did not depend on the numerical strength of its upholders, but entirely upon the authentic and expressed wish of the sovereign whose exercise of it had been tolerated. The usual method of exercising the direct veto was as follows: The three rulers in whose power it was to use the veto had each an official representative among the Cardinals. Whenever, therefore, one of these rulers wished to have a certain candidate debarred from the Papacy, he issued orders to that effect and had them transmitted to the Cardinal who was to represent him at the conclave. This Cardinal then, taking up his position at the door of the chapel where the voting was to take place, announced to each of the Cardinals as they filed in the name of the candidate whose election would be highly offensive to his sovereign. This was the usual, though not the invariable way in which the veto was exercised. Sometimes, instead of this method, the Cardinal went in person to the cells of the electors and announced to them that he had received instructions from his sovereign to veto the election of a certain candidate. A third method had begun to be used in more recent times. It consisted in notifying the wishes of the sovereign to the Cardinals when they were actually assembled for the voting. This, as we shall see later, was the method adopted at the conclave of 1903.

The question as to what rulers actually did possess this power is one on which writers are not unanimous. Every one agrees that this power was possessed by the rulers of Austria, France and Spain. Differences of opinion arise, however, as to whether the power was restricted to these three crowns. Many eminent authorities think that the power of veto was possessed also by the King of Portugal. Thus, for example, Monsignor Solieri, one of the foremost canonists in Rome and professor of canon law at the Propaganda University, in his article on the method of electing the Pope has the following words:

"It must also be borne in mind that when the Holy See became vacant the Emperors of Austria and France as well as the Kings of Portugal and Spain exercised for some centuries past a veto of exclusion, that is, they made known their unwillingness to accept the election if some specified Cardinal were elected Supreme Pontiff."

This same view is endorsed by other writers of note. Still, the view does not appear to be a correct one. Apart from the fact that there is no case recorded in history in which the King of Portugal used or attempted to use the direct veto, the Bull by which such power is supposed to have been vested in the Portuguese monarch is very generally admitted to be spurious.

Other writers—not very many, it is true—have held that the King of Naples must be numbered among the rulers possessing this power. If their contention were true, it seems only natural to suppose that the King of Naples would be aware that he possessed such power. Yet in 1823 the King of Naples was certainly unaware of it. In the August of that year King Ferdinand of Naples in a letter to Cardinal Ruffo, who was just setting out to the conclave which followed the death of Pius VII., writes as follows: "Since the monarch of the two Sicilies does not possess the right of exercising the direct veto, that right being reserved to the Courts of France, Spain and Austria, we rely on your sagacity to put into force all the means suggested by your great ability, that thus, through the medium of your adherents and friends, you may bring about an indirect exclusion." From a consideration of these facts we may safely say that to urge such a claim for the King of Naples is absurd, while the claim of the King of Portugal is highly improbable.

The precise time at which this veto originated is another subject that has called forth widely divergent views. Some declare it is to date back as far as the year 1059. In that year a synod was held in the Lateran Palace in Rome, during the course of which the following Decree was drawn up concerning the election of the Supreme Pontiff:

"If a fit person be found in the Roman Church, he is to be taken; if not, one may be sought elsewhere (provided always that the honor and reverence due to our beloved son Henry at present reigning or to any future emperor who shall have personally obtained this privilege from the Holy See shall in no way be impaired)."

This, according to some, is the first authentic instance we have of the existence of the veto which, after the break-up of the Holy Roman Empire passed into the hands of Austria, France and Spain. But such a notion is entirely erroneous. In the first place, many deny the authenticity of the clause in parenthesis, alleging that it was a subsequent interpolation of the imperialist party and is not to be found in the trustworthy acts of the synod. But passing over this and granting for the moment the authenticity of the clause, we must still dissent from the conclusion drawn from it. For indeed the mediæval emperors possessed no power whatsoever to interfere in Pontifical elections. The right which they did possess and which was officially confirmed to them in the Decree we have cited consisted merely in having the name of the Pope-elect notified to them after the election and before his consecration and by no means gave the emperor any right to suspend, even for a time, the Pope's consecration. And this was conceded to the emperors not at all as acknowledging any jurisdiction of the civil power in ecclesiastical matters, but as an act of courtesy to the rulers who were universally recognized as the protectors of the Catholic Church.

Other writers date the origin of the veto to the conclave held in the year 1305, at which Clement V. was elected. In that conclave, indeed, Philip the Fair, King of France, exerted all his influence to obtain the election of some Cardinal who would take his part in the noble work he was engaged in, namely, endeavoring to load with infamy the memory of the defunct Pope Boniface. To aid him in the conclave, he secured the services of Cardinal Pietro Colonna, whose terms with Pope Boniface had not been of the most cordial. But King Philip could not for a moment be said to have exercised a tolerated veto. What he did—or rather what he attempted to do—was to bribe all who were willing to be bribed and to frighten into submission all who were not. It is a consoling reflection to know that all his plotting was in vain, for Clement V., though a man of a very mild disposition, from the very beginning offered a brave and in the end a successful resistance to the unchristian designs of the arrogant monarch.

It was not until the early part of the sixteenth century that the veto began to take shape and form, though it did not develop fully

for more than a hundred years afterwards. When Pope Alexander VI. died in 1500 Rome was the camping ground of both the French and Spanish armies. So embarrassing was the situation that the Cardinals postponed the conclave until the troops were withdrawn. When the conclave finally did take place, Ferdinand, King of Spain, and Louis XII. manifested their preference for certain candidates. Of the two Cardinals supported by the King of France—Cardinals Vera and Piccolomini—the latter was elected. There is very little reason, however, to suppose that his election was in any way due to the wishes of King Louis. This action of the French and Spanish monarchs may be said to have dimly foreshadowed the veto. It was, in fact, a use of what was afterwards known as the *veto pro*; what we are directly treating of is known as the *veto contra*. At any rate, from that time on political influence became a thing which had to be reckoned with in Pontifical elections. We shall notice later on that the Church never ceased to protest against this odious yoke and extended merely a bare toleration to it in the hope of avoiding even greater evils.

Into any details of the great storm, commonly known as the Reformation, which swept over Europe during the sixteenth century, there is no necessity to enter, as the main features of the case are familiar to all. As regards the relations between the Church and the several States of Europe, it need only be said that while some broke into open rebellion against her, others, on the contrary, grew more and more closely allied to her. Prominent among the latter were France, Spain and the remnants of the old Roman Empire. After a while, however, it became quite evident that, as far as States were concerned, their enmity was almost preferable to their friendship. In return for the protection extended to the Church and guaranteed to Catholic worship, secular princes began to impose a most intolerable yoke in the exercise of her spiritual functions. Throughout the whole of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth century the Church, persecuted and harassed by her enemies, was compelled to tolerate the extortions of her friends. During this period and under these circumstances the veto matured into fullness. All through the conclaves of the sixteenth century kings and emperors vetoed one candidate, supported another. Sometimes Spain and Austria would form an alliance against France; then that alliance would be broken up and another formed, and so on until the damage done internally to the Church by her friends became much more serious than the external wounds inflicted on her by her enemies.

What strikes us most forcibly in this veto is the utterly absurd grounds on which, through the veto, candidates were debarred from

the Papacy. Possibly the chief—if not the sole—reasons why a man should be vetoed would be either because of some serious irregularity of life or a complete lack of the power to govern. Yet such were never the grounds on which the monarchs objected to any Cardinal. Sometimes a candidate was opposed by France for no other reason than that he was supported by Spain. At the conclave held in 1550 Cardinal Pole was objected to by the French King, whose sole objection to him was that he was an Englishman!

By some happy design of Providence the influence of both French and German Cardinals was, during the sixteenth century, almost entirely destroyed at the very time that its existence seemed to be most disastrous to the Church. Internal discord took away the attention of France, while the restless activity of Turkey caused the people of Austria and Hungary to concentrate all their activities on that nation. With the election of St. Pius V. in 1566 began what is known as the era of "Spanish predominance." The only opposition which Spain received during this period came from the Cardinals of Venice as well as from the adherents of a few old Italian families.

In the seventeenth century, however, French influence revived again and Austria, having laid Turkey in the dust, was enabled to return once more to the turmoil of European affairs. At the conclave held after the death of Pope Gregory XV. in 1623 the veto practically assumed the shape and form in which it existed at the time of its abolition. Just at the end of the century its form underwent another very small change, but we may say that substantially the veto abolished in 1909 was first used in 1623. It is interesting to note that one of the candidates vetoed on that occasion was Cardinal Borromeo, nephew of the great St. Charles. Throughout most of this century it is noticeable that the veto was very rarely exercised by Austria, but very often by France and Spain. The reason is not hard to find. The veto from beginning to end was used as a political weapon and was employed against a candidate, not for unorthodoxy in religion, but in politics. Now, during most of this century there existed a tacit alliance between France and Austria, the object of the alliance being to overthrow the Spanish predominance of which we have already made mention. It followed naturally that any Cardinal hostile to Austria was hostile also to France, while, on the other hand, any one favored by France could confidently rely on the support of Austria. But even this strong partnership could not always effect its end. In the conclave held after the death of Urban VIII., in 1643, France vetoed Cardinal Pamphili, who was supposed to be extremely pro-Spanish in sentiment and had held for many years the post of Nuncio to

the court of King Philip. In spite, however, of the wishes of both France and Austria, Cardinal Theodoli managed to get the lodging of the veto suspended, and Cardinal Pamphili actually was chosen as Pope. At practically every conclave between the years 1650 and 1700 the veto was used. At the last conclave of the century, held in 1691, the veto went through its last evolution and assumed the form in which it reached us in the twentieth century.

This final change in the veto may best be inferred from the words of Cardinal Medici, who, writing to the Emperor Leopold I., says "that the simple manifestation of your royal wish would be obeyed by all." It simply meant, then, that any candidate vetoed by one of the three sovereigns would be considered as "out of the running" by the Cardinals. Just about this time, also, the custom began of lodging the veto not before the conclave, but during it, when the candidate to be vetoed seemed likely to obtain the necessary number of votes. This idea is set forth by the Emperor Leopold I. in a letter which he sent to his representative at the conclave of 1700: "If it should come to pass," wrote the Emperor, "that Cardinal Panciatici seems likely to be elected Pope and that this cannot be prevented by any other means, you will make it known to the assembled conclave that I lodge against him the veto of exclusion, for the doing of which I have most just reasons." Fortunately, however, Cardinal Panciatici never for a moment did seem likely to be elected Pope, so the Emperor's representative was spared all trouble.

Through the course of this century another external change took place, for now Spain more or less dropped out, leaving France and Austria in almost undisputed possession of the veto. Times, of course, must change, and political alliances with them. In 1700 a fierce war—commonly known as the "War of the Spanish Succession"—broke out, and for many years kept Europe in a ferment. It is interesting to notice how uniformly unfortunate France has been whenever she tried to act the part of king-maker for the Spanish throne. She tried it in 1700, but was completely beaten; she tried it once more under Napoleon, but her candidate was thrown out after a brief and most unhappy reign. She tried it for the third time in 1870, and received for her pains a knockout blow from which she will not recover as quickly as many people expect. One of the effects of the war of 1700 was the close union of the crowns of Austria and Spain, which union was responsible for the fact that, as a general rule, they opposed and supported the same candidates at conclaves. The use of the veto, however, during this century was much less frequent than during the previous one.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the veto was

scarcely used at all. At almost every conclave, it is true, the three great powers had lodged their veto against some Cardinal or other, but luckily these vetoed candidates never ran such a chance of being elected as to need the introduction of the veto to exclude them. One exception occurred in the conclave held in 1823. At that conclave Cardinal Severoli was getting more and more votes as the scrutinies went on, till finally Cardinal Albani made it known to the Dean of the Sacred College that he had been entrusted by his royal master to veto him. At the conclave of 1846 Austria had intended to veto Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti. But the Emperor's orders were delayed or miscarried, and when finally they did arrive Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti had already been elected Pope. From that year may be dated the decline of the veto. It was only used once again, and on that occasion its victory, if any, was a pyrrhic one.

It will be useful for us to branch aside here, that we may inspect this veto under the light of Catholic theology and also that we may find out how it was, during its existence, regarded by the Roman Pontiffs themselves, whom it so intimately concerned. The consideration of these two questions will make more evident to us the naturalness of that spirit of opposition to the veto which grew more and more pronounced after 1846 and which eventually culminated in the Decree of January, 1909. The question to be decided is, "What precisely was this veto?" Some consider it to have been a right, others a privilege; the vast majority of Catholic writers claim that it was neither one nor the other. The question is one over which non-Catholic writers do not, of course, waste words. As the majority of them seem to regard the Pope as an individual who does as much harm as he can in this world and is consigned to the bottomest pit of the Inferno in the next, they cannot be expected to consider calmly whether it is more expedient that the future occupant of that sultry resting place should be selected with the help of the civil power or without it. We must therefore let them out of consideration, while we go on to discuss the various theories which are put forward to explain the nature of the veto.

Some writers are of opinion that this power of interfering in Papal elections by means of a veto is an inherent right of every civil power. The reason by which they sustain this extreme opinion is that a bad Pope is a source of the greatest danger to the common welfare. Since, then, the State is obliged to safeguard the common welfare, it follows that it possesses the right to prevent the election of the Papacy of any man likely to be a source of danger. This extreme opinion, however, is not held by many. Far more numerous

are those who hold that the right of veto does not belong to each and every civil power, but solely to the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, who enjoyed the title of "Protector of the Roman Church." Others again, while agreeing that the mere fact of being the civil power does not give the right of veto, think that this right pertains to the rulers of Austria, France and Spain, inasmuch as these three are, under different aspects, the successors of Charlemagne.

We cannot attempt, within the space of a short article, to enter into a prolonged discussion in refuting such opinions. As regards the first, we need only say that its admission would destroy entirely the notion of the Church being a perfect society. Though the Church has always taught that her Divine Founder laid down no hard and fast rules as to who should or who should not take part in the election of the Supreme Pontiff, yet it is equally true that she holds and defends from Scripture and tradition that Christ never conceded any jurisdiction whatsoever to the civil authority in spiritual matters. No one will attempt to deny that to decide who is or who is not to be her head is a matter which cannot be taken out of the hands of the Church without making her subservient and inferior to the State. Why, the right to elect its own chairman would be conceded without hesitation by all to an assembly of chimney-sweeps, yet few people would think of placing such an assembly on a level with the Catholic Church. Consequently, it is ridiculous to assert that each and every civil power can lawfully interfere in Papal elections. Very little more need be said about the second opinion. In the first place, the Holy Roman Empire does not exist to-day, but, even if it did, the fact of being its ruler would confer no right of vetoing in Papal elections. Such a right was never claimed by Constantine, nor, had he claimed it, would it ever have been willingly conceded to him.

Whatever about the truth or untruth of the supposition on which the third opinion is based, namely, that the rulers of Austria, France and Spain are, under different aspects, the successors of Charlemagne, the opinion itself is entirely untenable. Nothing is more natural than that the successors of a mighty Christian ruler should be treated with the utmost courtesy by the Court of Rome. But as far as obtaining a right to interfere in spiritual matters is concerned, they might just as well have been successors of "Old King Cole." At the same time it may be said that the resemblance between Charlemagne and some of the present rulers of France is—to say the least—not very striking.

The veto, then, cannot be regarded as belonging by right to any of the powers exercising it, but we must now consider whether

it is what is known as a *consuetudo juris*, that is to say, a right to do something acquired by the very fact of doing it frequently without hurt or hindrance. To many this would seem to meet the case of the veto. There is no doubt that for centuries the rulers of Austria, France and Spain manifested their likes and dislikes to the assembled Cardinals, while it is equally undeniable that, so far from being thrown out, this advice was, in the vast majority of cases, complied with. Many would therefore put the veto down as being just an "unwritten right." But the conclusion is entirely false. A little probing beneath the surface will soon reveal the fact that the veto fails absolutely to fulfill the conditions required for a *consuetudo juris*. In order that the fact of doing a thing may eventually establish a right to do it, four conditions are necessary. The thing done or the custom introduced must be reasonable or in accordance with the principles of common sense; it must be acknowledged, it must be lawfully prescribed and it must be approved. If the custom introduced fails in any one of those four conditions, it cannot be held to establish a right. We must therefore see whether the veto fulfills all these conditions, and to do so we must pass for a few moments into the plains of history.

If we wish to know whether the veto was in accordance with the principles of common sense, we have only to read history. Nothing could be more degrading or humiliating to the Catholic student than the perusal of the ridiculous pretexts under which, by means of this odious veto, good, saintly and learned prelates were excluded from the Papacy. Thus, for example, Cardinal Pole was excluded because he was an Englishman; Cardinal Borromeo was excluded because his uncle was a great reformer, and it was feared that he, if elected Pope, would "go and do likewise," and on pretexts of a like nature were excluded countless others. Now, when we consider that the only thing which should be taken into account was the candidate's fitness to rule the Universal Church, we can soon come to a conclusion as to whether the veto was in accordance with the principles of common sense. If a man who applied for a post as engine-driver were rejected on the grounds that he could not play the piano or the violin, what would the world at large say? Yet such a proceeding is infinitely more sensible than rejecting a man from the Papacy on the sole ground of his being an Englishman.

But from the fact that any custom does not fulfill the first condition, it follows that it cannot fulfill the third, or that it can never be lawfully proscribed. Until such time as the world shall have become one large lunatic asylum, no length of time can proscribe a custom which is contrary to reason.

The second condition is perhaps the least important of all. It regards the manner in which a custom must juridically be introduced. Canonists say that there must exist full knowledge, liberty, the intention of binding and uninterrupted continuity of exercise. Some of these conditions were not verified, or at least were not verified fully in the case of the veto. As a matter of fact, one of the powers frequently objected to another attempting to exercise the right of veto. At the conclave of 1691 Cardinal de Forbin-Janson, the representative of the French king, declared "that France and Spain alone possessed the right of exclusion, and that France would on no account tolerate such interference on the part of Austria."

The principal condition, however, which a custom requires is the approval of a legitimate superior. Approval may be of three kinds—it may be express, tacit or presumed. We must therefore consider whether the Roman Pontiffs—who are the legitimate superiors in this case—can be said to have ever given either express or tacit or presumed consent to the veto.

An express sanction of the veto would be any authentic act or document of a Roman Pontiff approving of this custom or recognizing it as a right of the three Catholic States. Needless to say, no such document exists or ever did exist. No Pontiff has been so unmindful of the exalted dignity of his office as to reduce it to the level of a political job.

Nor was there any silent consent about the veto. As far as was possible, the Roman Pontiffs have ever tried to keep Papal elections regulated as strictly ecclesiastical affairs. Time and again succeeding Popes have raised their voices against secular influence; they exhorted the electors to consider only the welfare of God's Church and to lay aside all political considerations. It will be sufficient to notice while passing the various Pontifical acts in which the Roman Pontiff openly and strongly condemned the veto. It was condemned by Pius IV. in the Bull *In eligendis*, by Gregory XV. in the Bull *Æterni Patris*, by Clement XII. in the Bull *Apostolatus officium*. As we have not yet begun to treat of the overthrow of the veto, which became more and more of a necessity from the time of Pius IX. onwards, we will omit for the present that Pontiff's condemnations of it.

It may be very fairly objected by non-Catholics that there was no sincerity in these condemnations. If they were sincere, we will be told, how can we account for the fact that the Pontifical injunctions were not carried out, but, on the contrary, Austria, France and Spain were left in undisturbed possession of their veto for centuries after? And, they will continue, if the instructions of Pius

IV., Gregory XV. and Clement XII. were not acted upon, how do we know that the Decree of Pius X. will not be treated in the same way? We must be excused for treating the second question first. Since the question as to how the Decree of Pius X. will be treated regards the future, we will not undertake to answer it. One thing, however, is certain, that any one who violates it will incur the penalty of excommunication, so that perhaps its violations will not be quite so numerous as some people imagine.

To compare the condemnation of Pius X. with that of the other Pontiffs is stupid and ridiculous. The Decree of Pius X. was imperative, and its violation, for any cause whatsoever, is followed by the penalty of excommunication; the injunctions of the other Pontiffs were exhortations and their violation, for a just reason, was followed by no penalty at all. Now as regards the first question, which amounts to this, "Were those condemnations of Pius IV. and the other Popes merely bluff?" we answer that most decidedly they were not, but were quite as sincere, though not quite as drastic, as the condemnation of Pius X. But the reason of their not being acted upon is very simple. The Papal policy—if we may use such an expression—has always been to maintain peace with the various powers with which it is brought into contact. Now, though the Papacy is brought into contact with every power under the sun, it was brought into contact in a special manner with Austria, France and Spain during the period in which the veto was tolerated. For while other powers—England, for example—rejected the Papacy, burned its places of worship, put its priests to the sword, Austria, France and Spain came forward to protect Catholicity and, as far as was in their power, obtain its free exercise all the world over. These States thus became, in a certain manner, the guardians of the Papal policy. Consequently the Papacy, through motives of prudence, was willing to tolerate that in the selection of the Pope, the personification, as it were, of the Papal policy, the rulers of such States as helped to defend and expand that policy should have their say.

It must not, however, be concluded from what we have said that the veto was an explicit or even an implicit bilateral contract between the Church and the Catholic powers. There never was any contract at all; so that, as far as strict justice was concerned, what was done by Pius X. a few years ago could have been done by any other Pontiff during the past three hundred years.

Neither can it be said that the Pontiff's approbation could be presumed. Presumed consent must rest on two suppositions. In the first place, the superior whose consent is presumed must be

ignorant of the custom which is being introduced, and, secondly, the custom itself must be a rational one. The first supposition certainly was absent in the case of the veto. No one could suppose for a moment that the Popes were ignorant of a custom practiced under their eyes. That the second supposition also was not verified, or that the veto was entirely out of harmony with common sense, we have already endeavored to show.

The veto, then, was nothing more or less than an abuse, an encroachment, the principle of which was always bitterly resented by the Catholic Church. It was, we may say, the price unjustly extorted by secular princes for protection, which the love of truth and zeal for the welfare of God's Church should have made a duty and not a task. And for centuries the Church consented to pay this heavy penalty rather than damage any further the interests of religion. And now we must go on to consider why it was that even the exercise of this veto could no longer be permitted, but was explicitly condemned by the reigning Pontiff.

Into any particulars of the revolutions which convulsed Europe about the middle of the last century it is unnecessary to enter, as they are well known to all. Though the revolutions were marked by different tendencies in different countries, yet in one particular respect they all agreed, namely, in implacable opposition to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Ever since that eventful period the legislation of most European countries has steadily progressed on lines which every one knows the Catholic Church will and must oppose. To the smoldering flames additional fuel was added by the action of the Vatican Council in 1870. To the average Protestant mind the definition of Papal Infallibility has never been anything but a move on a political chessboard. It was, in their opinion, the last throw of a desperate gambler. The Pope, they argued, seeing that he had irretrievably lost all power in the political world, attempted to regain it by spiritual arms. It mattered nothing that Infallibility was believed as universally in 1770 as it was in 1870; it mattered nothing that Infallibility is confined to the domain of faith and morals; all that mattered was that men like Bismarck in Germany and Gladstone in England proclaimed the definition to be a political stroke, and for the non-Catholic masses the question was settled.

In the midst of all this strife and turmoil we may be quite sure the authorities of the Church were more than ever vigilant. The conviction was borne in on them that the day had gone when they could, even in the smallest degree, "put their trust in princes," and in consequence they carefully took their bearings. To any mind it must be evident that the veto, giving as it did the civil authority

considerable influence in an ecclesiastical matter of the highest importance, should have been regarded at once with the greatest suspicion and dislike.

What we may regard as the first move towards the abolition of the veto was made by Pius IX. in 1871 when he touched on the question of Papal elections in the Bull *In hac sublimi*. The Pontiff warned the electors that a candidate should be selected: "Any intervention on the part of the civil power of whatsoever grade or condition having been entirely prevented and removed." This and similar pronouncements from the head of the Church gave considerable annoyance to the statesmen who had made up their minds that the only way in which the Church could be tolerated at all was by making her a little dependency of the State. They were especially annoying to the great German Chancellor, Bismarck, who was just then in the zenith of his glory and was simply bubbling over with Pan-Germanism—a natural result of the whipping to which he had just treated France. In May, 1872, Bismarck sent round a note to his diplomatic agents in which he stated that, considering the revolution which had been wrought in the Church by the definition of the Vatican Council, the civil power had undoubtedly acquired the right to take a part in future conclaves. "Before the civil governments admit the election of any Pope whatsoever," wrote the Chancellor, "and authorize him to make use of these powers, they are justified in demanding that his election and his person offer such guarantees as must of necessity be demanded, lest such power should be abused." The idea of the Pope being "authorized" by the civil authority to use his spiritual powers was a characteristic Bismarckism.

Just about this same time—possibly, indeed, as a natural result of this and similar expressions of opinion—a rumor was spread around that Pius IX. was contemplating the abolition of the veto. The Pontiff had, as we have seen, spoken pretty forcibly on the subject in his Bull of the previous year. Concerning the rumor of the Pope's intention, one of the Roman papers—the *Osservatore Romano*, a Vatican organ—on the 29th of June, 1872, has the following comment:

"If it were true, the Church would only be protecting herself against the insidious plots of some of her adversaries. Austria, France and Spain, at the time when their veto was taken into consideration by the electors, were States preëminently Catholic, where heresy and free thought were not placed on an equal footing with Catholic belief. How can it be supposed that the Holy See would be willing to entrust, even indirectly, its most vital interests to an Andrassy, to a Thiers or to a Torilla or to any worse un-

believer whom the ups and downs of politics may place at the head of a government?"

To this very truthful statement we can only say that it could have been repeated every day from 1872 to 1909. What kind of a Pope would we be likely to have if, for example, the present-day rulers of France had anything to say to his election? The ups and downs of politics in that country have certainly succeeded in bringing some very extraordinary individuals to the surface.

Once more did Pius IX. raise his voice against this cruel yoke. In his Bull *Licet per Apostolicas*, promulgated on September 8, 1874, the saintly Pontiff, referring to future conclaves, wrote as follows:

"We beseech the Cardinals that they proceed to the election without any prejudice of mind, swayed by the wishes of no one, unmoved by the pleadings of powerful secular princes; but, intent solely upon the glory of God and the utility of the Church, that they strive to elect as quickly as possible him who, in their judgment, will be, more than any other, a worthy and vigilant pastor of Christ's universal flock." This same admonition the Pope reiterated in the Bull *Consulturi*, promulgated five months before his death.

Meanwhile the anti-Catholic press of Europe continued to beat the drum of aggression against the Papacy. In 1875 the *Post*—a German paper and an enthusiastic supporter of Bismarck's ecclesiastical policy, expressed the opinion that the time was now ripe for all the powers "to hold a general conference for the purpose of determining the conditions of a conclave and of defining under what circumstances Pontifical acts would be regarded as valid in the eyes of the powers." Such was the state of affairs when Pope Pius IX. died in 1878.

The conclave which followed the death of Pius IX. was watched with intense interest by Catholics and non-Catholics all the world over. When the aged Pontiff was dying several papers had openly suggested that after his death the Italian Government should complete the work of 1870 by forcing its way into the Vatican and refusing to allow the election of any Cardinal who would not recognize the new order of things and renounce for ever the Papal claims to temporal sovereignty. And unquestionably there were many prominent men in Italy who would be only too happy if such a suggestion were complied with. Fortunately no such drastic measure was adopted, and the conclave—which proved to be a very short one—was held without disturbance or hindrance of any kind. In this conclave the veto was not used at all. It is said—though the authenticity of the tale is very doubtful—that France would, as a matter of fact, have lodged a veto against a certain prominent

Cardinal had he at any time seemed likely to be elected. The objection to him was that when French pride was humbled to the dust by the capitulation of Napoleon III. at Sedan this prelate had given a banquet to some of his friends to celebrate the event. However, the veto was not required, as the Cardinal in question got no vote at all at the conclave.

Throughout the long and eventful pontificate of Pope Leo XIII. Catholic opinion grew stronger and stronger against the veto. One theological writer in an article on the veto of exclusion, written during this period, asks very pertinently: "What is the meaning of this right of exclusion exercised even at present by the Emperor of Austria as well as by the rulers of France and Spain, if these sovereigns are no longer in reality the protectors of the Church? They have evidently no pretext for upholding their pretension." These words give the key to the situation. The rulers of these countries had ceased to be in any way whatsoever the protectors of the Church, and thus they had withdrawn the only pretext on which even a *tolerari potest* could be extended to their meddling in ecclesiastical affairs.

But the trend of political events during this period succeeded in making the further existence of the veto not merely undesirable, but positively ridiculous. For while France on the one hand entered upon that furious campaign against Catholicity, which is not yet ended, and set itself, in the forcible language of one of its politicians, "to extinguish the star that shone over the stable of Bethlehem," Austria on the other entered with Germany and Italy into that political league known as the Triple Alliance, and by so doing undertook to secure to the House of Savoy its unjust possession of Rome. Could anything be more ridiculous than to expect that France, if it were going to war to-morrow with Germany, should first send a polite message to the Emperor William at Berlin to ask him if he had any objection to this or that general being put in command of the French troops or to inform him that France objected to some general or other of his and demanded that he should receive no post of authority during the campaign? We can quite imagine the reception which such a message would receive at the Prussian Court. Yet this absurd policy many think the Catholic Church should tolerate, for that is just about what the veto would amount to in the world of to-day.

There seems every reason to believe that the Triple Alliance intended making use of the veto for purposes far other than the glory of God and the utility of the Church. A leading German newspaper—the *Frankfort Gazette*—made no secret at all of this fact. Towards the close of the last century, when the advanced years

and failing health of Pope Leo XIII. made it evident that another conclave would very soon take place, the *Gazette* in an article on the subject contained this significant passage: "The Triple Alliance is making preparations even now for the future conclave. England, Italy and Germany have brought pressure to bear on the Emperor of Austria to make him use his right of veto. The Pope remains, as ever, a great political power, which must be taken into account, and of this the States of the Triple Alliance are well aware. If Austria resolves to make use of its right of veto, it will take care that the Cardinal to whom this task is entrusted does not arrive too late."

The Catholic standpoint at the same period was very concisely expressed by Monsignor Giobbio, one of the professors of the University of Milan, in a little work on the veto, published in 1897. After having shown the hostility displayed by France and Austria towards the Church in their modern legislation and having called attention to the insignificant part which Spain plays in the Europe of to-day, the learned professor concludes: "These considerations lead me inevitably to the following conclusion: Since the rulers of the three great Catholic powers in their actual legislation have apostatized from Catholicism, proclaiming atheism and State neutrality, it follows as a natural consequence that these reasons which formerly permitted the Holy See to tolerate the veto of exclusion exist no longer and the rulers would have no just ground for complaint if no further notice is taken of their attempted exclusions."

And this is precisely what did occur very soon. In the very next conclave the veto was repudiated and, shortly after the coronation of the new Pope, was abolished entirely.

Many accounts of the conclave which followed the death of Pope Leo XIII. have already been written, and its details are in consequence well known. From the very beginning it was quite evident that the choice of the Cardinals would eventually fall upon either Cardinal Rampolla, Cardinal Gotti or Cardinal Sarto. Of the three, Cardinal Rampolla, in the beginning, seemed by far the most likely. At the opening session, held on the morning of August 1, 1903, the votes accorded to these three Cardinals were: Cardinal Rampolla, 24; Cardinal Gotti, 17; Cardinal Sarto, 5.

In the second sitting, held the same evening, Cardinals Rampolla and Sarto went up, while Cardinal Gotti received one vote less. The numbers were: Cardinal Rampolla, 29; Cardinal Gotti, 16; Cardinal Sarto, 10.

Just when the Cardinals were about to cast their votes for the third time, on the morning of August 2, they were treated to a mild surprise by the introduction of the veto. Cardinal Puzyna,

Archbishop of Cracow, had received instructions from the Emperor of Austria to lodge, in his name, the veto against Cardinal Rampolla if it seemed at all probable that he would be the candidate selected by the Cardinals. After the second voting it became quite evident that Cardinal Rampolla might, at the very next sitting, receive the requisite number of votes, so nothing remained for Cardinal Puzyna but to declare his mandate at once. When, therefore, the Cardinals had assembled on the following morning for the third voting, Cardinal Puzyna, having requested permission from the Cardinal Dean to make an announcement, rose and in a voice trembling with emotion read the following note:

"Having been entrusted with this task by the highest authority, I wish to inform your Eminence in your position as Dean of the Sacred College and Camerlengo of the Holy Roman Church, humbly begging you to make the fact known officially in the name and by the authority of his Apostolic Majesty Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, that His Majesty, wishing to exercise a right and a time-honored privilege, lodges a veto of exclusion against my most worthy Lord Cardinal Mariano Rampolla.

† J. CARDINAL PUZYNA.

"Rome, August 2."

For a few moments after the reading of the note dead silence reigned in the Sistine. Then Cardinal Oreglia, the Dean of the Sacred College, to whom the note had been directly addressed, arose and in a voice perfectly audible to the whole assembly declared: "This communication will not be announced to the conclave either officially or officiously; no notice whatsoever will be taken of it." The Cardinal Dean was immediately followed by Cardinal Rampolla, who stood up—as one of the papers at the time described him—pale, stately and in this embarrassing moment resplendent with dignity. "I deplore the fact," said the Cardinal Secretary, "that in the election of a Pontiff a lay power has attempted such a serious interference with the liberty of the Church and with the dignity of the Sacred College; consequently, I strongly protest against it. In as far as this interference touches my humble self, I do declare that nothing would be more welcome to me, nothing would render me so happy."

The only other speaker was Cardinal Perraud, Bishop of Autun, who in the name of the French Cardinals protested energetically against this attempted civil interference. The electors then proceeded to the voting. That the Cardinals were uninfluenced by Austria's veto is pretty evident from the fact that in the first scrutiny held that morning Cardinal Rampolla maintained the twenty-nine votes he had received the previous evening, while in

the second scrutiny his votes actually rose to thirty. The figures for that day—the second day of the conclave—were:

First scrutiny—Cardinal Rampolla, 29; Cardinal Sarto, 21; Cardinal Gotti, 9.

Second scrutiny—Cardinal Rampolla, 30; Cardinal Sarto, 24; Cardinal Gotti, 3.

This was Cardinal Rampolla's zenith. From that on he continued to lose, and at the very next scrutiny Cardinal Sarto—who from the beginning had been going up by leaps and bounds—headed the list with twenty-seven votes, Cardinal Rampolla being second with twenty-four.

On the morning of August 4—the fourth day of the conclave—Cardinal Sarto received more than the required number of votes, and the conclave came to an end. The figures for the scrutiny held that morning were: Cardinal Sarto, 50; Cardinal Rampolla, 10; Cardinal Gotti, 2.

Most writers have agreed in admitting that the defeat of Cardinal Rampolla was in no way due to the veto lodged against him by the Emperor of Austria. Commenting on the event at the time of Cardinal Puzyna's death, which occurred on September 8, 1911, the *Corriere della Sera*—a Milan paper which will certainly not be accused of being over-Catholic in tone—expresses itself thus: "It cannot, however, be said that it was the Austrian veto which kept Cardinal Rampolla out of the Papacy, since it is well known that his votes afterwards actually went up by one. The candidature of Cardinal Sarto was determined by various circumstances, the chief one of which was the desire to select as Pope a prelate accustomed to active missionary life rather than to a diplomatic career."

Why precisely the Emperor of Austria did object to Cardinal Rampolla is not as yet known to the public. It is not, however, very difficult to supply a reason. There is no man in the Church who is so much open to all kinds of groundless suspicions as the Pope's Secretary. This post Cardinal Rampolla had held under Pope Leo XIII., and it is quite possible that it was something or other done by him in this capacity that brought the ill will of the Emperor upon him. Or it may be also that the objection to Cardinal Rampolla did not originate at all in the Court of Vienna, but much nearer home. This at least is the opinion expressed by the *Corriere della Sera*, which certainly would not throw suspicion on the Italian Government unless it had some grounds for its words. In the same article from which we have already quoted the *Corriere*, referring to the attempted exclusion of Cardinal Rampolla, says: "There is reason to believe that Italy was not entirely neutral in

this diplomatic manœuvre, and that the plan was concocted by the three cabinets of the Triple Alliance."

But the action of the Cardinals—though of course it sounded the death-knell of the veto, cannot be regarded as its official abolition. But Pope Pius X. did not hesitate long about endorsing their action and consummating the work which Cardinal Oreglia had begun. From the moment of his accession to the Papacy every one knew that the abolition of the veto was only a question of time. Nor was the general opinion doomed to be falsified. In his Apostolic Constitution, *Commissum nobis*, Pope Pius X. abolished absolutely and for ever any veto whatsoever on the part of the civil authority in Papal elections. Though the Decree was drawn up on January 20, 1904, and bears that date in its concluding passages, yet it was not officially promulgated till January, 1909, and it appears in the *Acta Pontificia* of that year.

The Pope's Decree is short and does not at all enter into a discussion on the origin or history of the veto. In the opening passages the Pontiff declares that the task entrusted to him of guarding the welfare of the Church imposes upon him the duty of rooting out and destroying any innovation or custom calculated to impede the Church in the exercise of her legitimate functions. Chief among these, he continues, is the veto of exclusion exercised for centuries by certain of the civil authorities. He then goes on to describe how this veto had always been objected to by the Holy See, giving as his authority the various Bulls condemning it, which we have already enumerated. After that, in forcible, concise language, the Pope formally and officially declares the veto abolished absolutely and for ever, ordaining further that any Cardinal attempting, under any pretext whatsoever, to introduce it at a future conclave shall incur the penalty of excommunication, the absolution of which is reserved *speciali modo* to the Pope who shall be elected at the conclave.

And thus ended after an existence of more than three centuries the veto exercised by the civil power in Papal elections. What seems rather strange now is that the Decree of Pius X., touching as it did on the vexatious question of the relations between Church and State, aroused very little comment in the anti-Catholic press of Europe. It seems too good to be true that the yellow journalists should display, even for once, a little common sense. The ravings we have recently been treated to over the *Ne Temere* Decree render such a supposition next to impossible. We may rest assured that when some political dodge is to be worked or some anti-Catholic frenzy is to be stirred up the Decree abolishing the lay veto will be dragged to light once more.

By learned Catholics who could appreciate the grave peril to which the veto exposed the Church the Pope's Decree was universally hailed with the greatest satisfaction. Just a short time before, Pope Pius X. in his first encyclical had declared that the motto of his pontificate would be "to restore all things in Christ." When he is dead and gone and the world is passing judgment upon him, people will, perhaps, come to see that few acts of his pontificate conduced more to the fulfillment of his chosen motto than his promptitude in abolishing for ever the long-standing veto of Austria, France and Spain.

W. J. HEGARTY.

Cork, Ireland.

THE ROMAN NAME.

NOT all titles historically so explainable and so frequently discussed are yet so commonly misknown as is "Roman" in its Catholic use. Father Thurston¹ and "Propagandist"² make strong opposition to the term "Roman Catholic." But the Church is Roman, notwithstanding. What, then, does "Roman" mean?

Of all writers most easily accessible to readers of English, the historians Bryce and Freeman and Bury guide us best in our search for the meaning of this word.

In the beginning there were no Romans except the free townsmen of Rome. For five centuries of the city's existence these were the only Romans. But when the city grew powerful enough to have needful allies the name of Roman was finally extended to these. In the year 88 before our era all such allies were admitted to citizenship. By this procedure the city parted forever with her exclusive right to the name of Roman. Birth or residence within the narrow bounds of the city was not a requisite for Romanism. Whoever fulfilled certain other conditions might, independently of abode and nationality, be or become a Roman. The first outsiders to be incorporated as Romans were various Italian nations. But Roman and Italian never became synonymous. Later the title and privileges of Roman were extended to peoples and individuals far beyond the confines of Italy. An edict of Caracalla bestowed on free men of all countries subject to imperial rule the rights of Roman citizenship.³ Romans might then be Italian in nationality,

¹ "History of the Name 'Roman Catholic,'" in *The Month*, September, 1911.

² "The Name of the Church," in *The Ecclesiastical Review*, February, 1903.

³ Cf. Bryce, "The Holy Roman Empire," new edition, p. 5.

or Spanish, or Gallic, or German, or Egyptian, or Greek, or anything else. Then and thereafter Romanism was the great expanse of world wherein lived all who enjoyed the civilization, the culture, the laws, the literature which prevailed throughout the empire. St. Paul, of Semitic blood and Græco-Jewish education and Christian religion, was as indisputably Roman⁴ as was any Latian of the Palatine or the Suburra.

Many languages were vernacular within the vast regions of this Roman world. But in imperial times no one of these was exclusively the Roman tongue. Latin had not vanquished all competitors in the West, although through the influence of Law and Church and Army and Letters it had spread ineradicably to remotest regions and had been adopted by groups of nations who in their endeavors to learn and use it created the Romance languages of to-day.⁵ In the East the expressive and adaptive language of the Greeks had long since become an ubiquitous lingua franca. But neither Greek nor Latin was all dominant; neither was the sole Roman tongue, although both were eminently Roman as being the chief languages of Romandom; and both, in their vernacular forms, were called Roman by the peoples in the provinces who spoke them.

The Romans of imperial times were therefore not citizens of one city exclusively. They were no one homogeneous people. They were various in nationality, in religion, in language. Romanism implied nothing racial, nothing local, no special fatherland. It was a species of government, a pale of civilization and culture, and later a religion—Christianity. The opposite of Romanism was simply barbarism and, later, heathenism.

In the creation of this Romanism many forces contributed. But Latinism and Hellenism were predominant. In many respects Latinism was the more active, and in other ways Hellenism was the more influential. In imperial times the Latin Romans may have been less numerous than the Hellenic. Many of the makers of Romanism were not Latins; very many of these makers were Greeks. Latin literature was scarcely more than one branch, one development, of Greek literature. Yet in some ways Hellenism was antagonistic to Latinism. But no such antagonism existed between Hellenism and Romanism; for Hellenism was part of the constitution of Romanism. Numerous great spirits of the empire were neither Latin nor Greek, but yet were Roman. It is perhaps incorrect to say that, except in language, Vergil and Horace and Tacitus and Juvenal were really Latins, although they

⁴ Acts xvi., 37-39.

⁵ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, "Einführung in das Studium der Romanischen Sprachwissenschaft," Heidelberg, 1901.

were Romans. Pliny in his *Historia Naturalis* has left us much information about art. And although he mentions a multitude of artists' names, of painters and sculptors and architects, none are Latin, and nearly all are Greek. Even in Rome itself the inhabitants were largely non-Latin, and had become a heterogeneous conglomeration of races.⁶ Vespasian expelled a number of undesirable inhabitants and imported into the city one thousand families from the provinces.⁷ Of the very emperors, all were Romans indeed, *imperatores Romani*, but not all were Tiberine by birth. Under Trajan the empire was in the zenith of its power; but Trajan was of Spanish birth. Maximinus, a Roman like all the others, was originally a Thracian shepherd. Philip became Roman emperor, but by birth and blood and nationality he was an Arabian. Romanism was civilization. And all nationalities on becoming recognizedly civilized were presumed to have become Roman. Varastad, the last victor who ever won a prize in the Olympic games, was an Armenian.⁸ But he was at the same time a Roman. Antagonism to Romanism was antagonism to civilization. Such actually was the prevailing sentiment of the barbarians, as they began to ascend into civilization. As for the Greeks, who had contributed so much to the formation of Romanism, they were, as early as our fourth century, more conscious of being Romans than of being Hellenes. This historic fact entered into their folklore and folksongs and religious feeling, and is there yet.

Since free men were Romans wheresoever they lived in the empire, and since the Roman emperor might originate from any province whatsoever, it was no embarrassment for citizens other than Latians to allow the emperor's right to reside in any city or portion of the empire wherever as military commander or civil monarch he could rule to best advantage. Tacitus⁹ had already implied as feasible such change of imperial residence; *posse principem alibi quam Romae fieri*. Constantine's new Rome on the Bosphoros was established against no serious opposition. Byzantion could hardly be called a new capital; it was the old capital in a new locality.

For Christianity to become identified with Romanism was historically logical. Christianity had become conterminous with civilization and with the empire. Christianity had absorbed and transformed all the cultural elements of Roman civilization. What term described the universal and ecumenical character of the empire also described the universal character of the Church. "Roman"

⁶ Juvenal, "Sat.," III., 60-125; Lucan, "Pharsalia," VII., 405.

⁷ Suetonius, "Vespasian," VIII.; Aurelius Victor, "De Gais," IX.

⁸ Kedrenos, I., 326.

⁹ "Hist.," I., 4.

was a more popular and demotic word, and less theological, than was "Catholic" to express the ecumenical influence and power of the divine institution. Romanism was the bond of solidarity which made a unit of the nations of the empire. Christianity had become this bond, and had thus become Roman. His Christianity became every man's strongest claim to the title of Roman.

After most Romans had become Christian, popular logic and language regarded as Romans only such as were of the Christian religion. Pagan communities and peoples were distinguished from the Romans and were called by their ancient national names. Thus in the Greek countries of the East the Christians called themselves Romans and were so called by others, while such Greeks as had remained pagan were known as "Hellenes." All Christians were Romans accordingly. But as they were outwardly distinguishable by their liturgical languages, and since their liturgical languages were chiefly two, Latin and Greek, we may divide the multitudinous Romans into two mighty sections, and may speak of Græco-Romans and Latino-Romans.

In the course of time the name of Roman remained more at home and more familiar in the East than in the West. The name survived longest where Romanism happened to be most intense, in old Rome and in the countries of Hellenic Romanism. For the first few centuries Christianity was densest in the East. Indeed the most thoroughly Christianized portion of the world may have been Asia Minor¹⁰ until subdued by Islamism. And since Christian Asia Minor was nothing if not Roman, all non-believers of the nearer East ended by calling all Christians "Romans." In the sixth century Chosroes the Second calls the kingdom of Byzantion "Romania," which means "Romandom."¹¹ In the eyes of Persians, Arabs and Turks, Constantinople was the great city of the Romans.¹² The Seljuk monarchs who from 1074 to 1307 reigned at Ikonion called themselves "sultans of Roum," because they were ruling over cities and territory which they had taken from the Romans or Christians. In Arabic a common word for "Christian" is "Roum" or "Rum." In the Arabic language of the Spanish Moors the word "rumiya" meant a Christian slave-girl.¹³ In Arabic literature the "king of Roum" is the Byzantine emperor, the emperor of the Christians. In the name of "Erzeroum" the last syllable records the fact that this city was Christian, and Roman therefore, before

¹⁰ Cf. Harnack, "Expansion of Christianity," English translation, II, p. 326.

¹¹ Bury, "Later Roman Empire," fifth ed., I, 148, note.

¹² Pears, "The Fall of Constantinople, Being the Story of the Fourth Crusade," p. 3.

¹³ "Encyclopedia Britannica," s. v. "Rum."

its capture by the Moslems. After the conquest the Turks knew the Patriarch of Constantinople as "Patriarch of the Romans," *Roum Patrinski*;¹⁴ and the Christians subject to the Patriarch were called *Roum Miletî*, or "Roman people." Such names as Roumeli, Roumeli-Hissar, Roumelia, all bear witness to the truth that the name of "Roman" if not elsewhere, at least in the East, came to be clearly synonymous with "Christian."

In Theophylaktos the "Romans" are the common people of the empire who speak colloquial and not literary Greek. Pachymeres,¹⁵ however, calls the Latin language "Roman," as indeed it was; for both Latin and Greek were Roman. But in the East as early as Prokopios the language ordinarily designated as Roman was the Greek. Priscus in narrating an embassy to the Huns calls men from the western part of the empire "Western Romans."¹⁶ And for him Valentinian is emperor of the "Western Romans." This implies that his own countrymen he regards as Romans of the East. Theophanes frequently calls the Asiatic portion of the Byzantine Empire "Romania," a name which in this use distinguishes Christian from non-Christian Asia. Georgios Akropolites in the thirteenth century calls his Greek countrymen "Romans," and designates certain Western Christians by their national name of Italians.¹⁷ From the time of Charlemagne most Eastern writers, in harmony with popular belief as well as with official usage, speak of their countrymen as "Romans" and call the Western peoples "Franks" or "Latins."

Evidencing his designs to become highest ruler in the Balkan countries, Symeon¹⁸ of Bulgaria assumed the title of "Tsar of the Bulgars and Emperor of the Romans."¹⁹ Theodor Laskaris²⁰ styled himself *imperator et moderator Romeorum et semper Augustus*.²¹ Michael²² is *imperator et moderator Romanorum*.²³ Not many years ago Mr. Eftaliotis wrote in colloquial Greek a history of his country. He inscribed it *A History of Romanism*.²⁴ Even unto to-day, therefore, in the people's patois, the name of the Christian Greeks is "Roman." To think that this adhesion to the Roman name was

¹⁴ Polltes, "Hellanes he Romliol," p. 12.

¹⁵ "Michael Palaeologos," V., p. 399, ed. Bonn.

¹⁶ Cf. Bury, I, 216.

¹⁷ "Annals," p. 18, 9-11.

¹⁸ 893-927.

¹⁹ Cf. Gelzer, in Krumbacher, "Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur," second ed., p. 979.

²⁰ 1204.

²¹ Cf. Gregorovius, "Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter," I, p. 354, note.

²² 1261.

²³ Gregorovius, I, 411, note.

²⁴ "Historia tes Romeosunes."

and is artificial or fictitious, an *Erdichtung*, as Gregorovius lists it,²⁵ is to misunderstand completely the peoples of the Eastern Roman world.

When the empire began to lose Italy to Lombard and Goth, the traditional imperial rule held out more tenaciously in that part which was the exarchate of Ravenna. The exarchate endured until 752. And simply because this territory continued thus under Byzantine rule it was called "Romagna," or "Romanland," for Byzantine rule was Roman and Byzantine territory was Roman.²⁶

After the epochmaking events at Rome in the year 800 the fealty of the West to Charlemagne's Romanism inclined to cease acknowledging the rival Romanism of the East. Yet many Western writers did continue to call the Eastern empire "Romania," which had to mean "the land of the Romans." Athaulf uses this name.²⁷ Hugues, king of the Franks, in a letter²⁸ negotiating a marriage with a Byzantine princess, speaks of the East as "imperium Romanum" and "sanctum imperium." But Frederick the First, when addressed as "maximus princeps Alemanniae," retorted on Isaac Angelos by asserting his own title of *Romanorum imperator*, and added that *Romaniorum*, derived from the Thracian province of Romania, would be the more proper one for the East.²⁹

The Crusaders called the Eastern countries Romania or Romanland, not only because they had perhaps in their own homeland learned this name for the East, but also because they found it universal in the Eastern world. When the Latins took possession of Constantinople in 1204 they called their Latin empire Romania.³⁰ Early in their career the Franciscans established themselves in Greece, in the "province of Romania."³¹ However, this recognition of the *Romanitas* of the East was not without its many and significant exceptions. The Pope, in writing to Nikephor Phokas regarding Theophano's marriage to the Western emperor, addressed Phokas as *imperator Græcorum*. Phokas resented the title.³²

The historical fact is that Romanism was ubiquitous; it was both Eastern and Western. Orosius was not wrong when he wrote: "Wherever I go . . . I am a Roman amongst Romans. . . . Everywhere I find my Fatherland."³³

²⁵ "Stadt Athen," I, 106.

²⁶ Cf. Gregorovius, I, 107, note; Bury, II, 514.

²⁷ Orosius, "Historiae adv. Pag.," VII, 42. Cf. Bury, I, 148.

²⁸ Cf. Schlumberger, "Basile II.," pp. 615 ff.

²⁹ Cf. Bryce, pp. 343 and 527.

³⁰ "Letters of Pope Innocent," ed. Baluze, II, 207; Sanudo, "Istoria del Regno di Romania;" Hopf, "Griechenland," 267; Luitprand, "In Legat.," in "Script. Italic.," II, I, 481; Du Cange, "Histoire de Constantinople," I, p. 425.

³¹ Wadding, "Annal. Min.," I, 202.

³² Bryce, p. 140.

³³ Cf. Boissier, "La Fin du Paganisme," II, p. 408.

It was no innovation at the end of the eighth century for the nations of the North to be treated as Romans by the Sovereign Pontiff. All Christians were Romans. If Charlemagne was to be emperor he could be none other than Roman. The imperial dignity included within itself the note of Romanism. As centuries later,⁸⁴ so in those days the Roman Empire was regarded as a perpetual institution. And indeed Romanism was to be perpetual, but not in its imperial form. Never had the Popes stood in opposition to Romanism. When the Northern Italians plotted secession from the iconoclast Leon, Pope Gregory the Second admonished them *ne a fide vel amore imperii Romani desisterent*.⁸⁵ A time came, however, when the Popes were weary of their position towards the East-Roman potentates. They could well remember how Sylverius and Martin the First had been humiliated by Byzantine emperors. The Byzantine armies were no longer able to protect the West. A Western emperor was needed. Charlemagne was eminently the proper person. And from the hands of the Pope he received the crown of the Roman Cæsars.

Through this "translation" no new empire was created. Charlemagne was a successor to the deposed Constantine of Byzantium.⁸⁶ After him two empires are recognized by many modern historians. But the mediæval peoples never well understood the legitimacy of two empires, just as they did not understand two kinds of Romanism. The Romans under each empire knew very little about their rivals, and thought themselves the only genuine Romans. Each emperor theoretically claimed to be ruler of all Romans and of all Romandom. It is most true that although one legitimate Roman Empire did not extend everywhere, one historic Romanism actually did exist, which was universal. Both empires were Roman by the same Romanism, which had become Christianity. Charlemagne in a letter to the Byzantine Emperor Michael mentions the Oriental and the Occidental empires as if both were genuine. And Eginhard,⁸⁷ his biographer, still called the Byzantine rulers "Romani imperatores."

The Holy Roman Empire, in its Western form, shadowy as it was at times, but never unrevered, existed down to the year 1806, when it disappeared under Napoleon's compulsion. The Byzantine Roman Empire had ceased with the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Did Romanism perish with these two empires? If not, wherein does it consist?

⁸⁴ Cf. Dante, "De Monarchia."

⁸⁵ "Liber Pontificalis," ed. Duchesne, I, p. 407; Paulus Diaconus, XLIV. Cf. Bryce, p. 38.

⁸⁶ "Chron. Moissiac," anno 801, in Pertz, "Mon. Hist. Germ.," I, 505. Cf. Freeman, "Holy Roman Empire," p. 144, note.

⁸⁷ Vita Karoli, 38. Cf. Bryce, p. 62, note.

Now what is Romanism in the life of the Church?

Peter's choice of the city of Rome may have been occasioned by the fact that Rome was then the capital of the empire and of the world and the centre of civilization. If Cæsar had removed the capital to Troy, as he may have contemplated doing,³⁸ then the local community of Christians in that capital might well have been called "Trojans," but yet universal Christendom might possibly have been "Roman," being Trojan only in Troy, and Roman both there and everywhere. The *ecclesia Romanorum* may be theoretically distinguished from the *ecclesia quæ in civitate Roma* or the *ecclesia quæ in civitate Troja*. Yet all are Roman. The *ecclesia Romanorum* is the Church coextensive with all civilization. It is ecumenical, and ecumenical both locally and as a whole. The term "Roman" when first applied to the Church was used in such sense as the adjective then conveyed, and not with the meaning which it had, *regnante Romulo*. In the earliest Christian times communities dwelling beyond the borders of the empire may not yet have been conscious of participation in Romanism.³⁹ But as soon as Christian and Roman became in popular estimation convertible terms, then all such communities began to grow identified with Romanism. When the local community of Christians in the city of Rome acquired a peculiar adjective of its own, this word was "Roman," and in a twofold sense. These Christians were Roman because of their residence in the city of Rome; but were also Roman in the more universal sense, just as the inhabitants of Alexandria or Marseilles were Romans.

Under Constantine concord was established between the Church and the empire. But the removal of the imperial capital from the Tiber to the Bosphoros occasioned some confusion in Romanism. The supreme head of ecclesiastical Romanism remained in Italy, while the centre of political Romanism was removed to the East. But the departure of the emperor did not subtract anything from the Romanism of the Pope, as it also did not lessen his own imperial Romanism. Moreover, if the Pope had accompanied the emperor and had transferred his see to Byzantium, he would not thereby have abandoned Romanism, since his see is Roman independently of locality. The emperor's Rome was wherever the emperor was. And wherever the Pope is, there is the Pope's Rome; *ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia*. For the Pontifex Romanus is Pontifex Romanorum.

In the West the Popes finally became the source of all official

³⁸ Suetonius, "Cæsar," 79; Strabon, 13, 1, 27.

³⁹ Cf. Burkitt, "Early Christianity Outside of the Roman Empire," Cambridge, 1899.

Romanism. In spiritual Romanism they had been universally supreme from the beginning, and in political Romanism their influence steadily had grown ever since the departure of Constantine, becoming more active in proportion as the Byzantine Empire came to have less and less significance for Western Europe. Bartolus, commenting on the Pandects,⁴⁰ writes: *Omnes gentes quæ obediunt S. matri ecclesiæ sunt de populo Romano.*

After the creation of the Germanic Roman Empire a new distinction between Eastern and Western Romanism became more prominent, affecting ecclesiastical Romanism chiefly. The Eastern authorities, conscious of the historic magnificence of the Roman name, almost ceased to concede it to Western Christianity, which they preferred to know as "Latin." And the Western Church more and more frequently referred to Eastern Christians as "Greeks." These names were simply descriptive of linguistic conditions. The Western Church almost felt that Latin was part of her well-being, and the Eastern Church had similar attachment to Greek.

A historical knowledge of the word "Roman" helps to a deeper appreciation of the Pope's title to Pontifex Romanus. Once the schism divided the two great portions of the Church, then the legitimate Roman part, ecclesiastically, was certainly that part which remained in communion with the Roman Pontiff, who is Pontifex Romanorum as well as Pontifex Romanus. When the schism came, as ever before that time and mostly ever since, the Pontifex Romanorum was residing officially at Rome. But he did not reside there, perhaps, by actual necessity of his high office. When the Pope so wished they resided at Avignon. If at any future time it were expedient, they could reside in any city of their choice, East or West. It may not be impossible to imagine circumstances that would justify Papal abandonment of old Rome and establishment of residence, even perpetual, amongst those Romans who are most clearly the continuators of the inhabitants of the Christian empire and who, though now rebels to his Pontifical authority, are nevertheless of all the most naturally adapted to understand and profit by his teachings and guidance. The Oriental Christians are Romans by an adoption much older and much more real and more conspicuous in history than are the descendants of the Frankish and other Northern Romans. Indeed, a Roman Pontiff should appear in no way strange to the East. The Romanorum Pontifex is head of the Church, has primacy over the whole earth. The Oriental Christians should not confuse Latinism and Romanism, thinking that Catholic belief restricts to the "Latinorum pontifex" this pri-

⁴⁰ XLVIII., I., 24; de Captivis et postliminio Reversis. Cf. Bryce, p. 277, note.

macy in all things religious, as though there had ever been discovered or proclaimed an identity of Romanism and Latinism.

The Christian religion is deeply a mystical, an ideal, a reverential religion. Such a religion is more congenial to the East than to the West, as it also is nearer to its own in the South than in the North. The ensouling and spiritualizing of life are more easily possible in the East than in the West. The West idolizes what pleasure and profit it can see and touch. The Eastern mind can meditate in the realm of the increate, the superhuman, the religious; and finds therein a satisfying reality.

The Pope is Father of all the Romans, new and old, Eastern and Western, Latin and Greek, Catholic and Orthodox, obedient and rebellious. He may with perfect propriety reside anywhere, for his realm extends everywhere. As pontifex Romanus he is supreme pontiff of all Romeland, Pope of Romandom.

If one wished to speculate about the improbable, about the departure of the Pope from Rome, the older and more historical cities, especially such as have been intimately associated with the history of Christianity, might be preferably considered as fit for Papal residence. Cities of America are too new. Western Europe could not unanimously offer a city preëminently suitable and universally acceptable. Russia is Catholic; but, besides being in schism, has the common Northern unintelligence of the essence of religion. The older patriarchs, such as Antioch or Alexandria, offer political difficulties, and most of the surrounding population is not Christian.

But there is one beautiful city whose new life, inspired by the consciousness of a gloriously spiritual past, would seem to have a special suitability. And that is Athens. Athens has indeed never been a leading force in Christianity. But, nevertheless, Athens is the centre and life of an idealism which is so necessary to Christianity. There is in the Greek character an inherent spirituality which suits it for what relates to the universal and the everlasting. That the mediæval enemies of the East propagated unfavorable views and opinions about the Greeks, and that we have uncritically accepted these views in all our estimates of the East is due more to Western unfairness and interested credulity than to Eastern guilt. The spirit of Hellenism is not so much for imperial dominion. It is for things of the soul. There is no Catholic **abhorrence against** anything in the Eastern Church, outside of the dogmatic points which have been disputed by theologians and scholars of both Churches. The magnificent ritual of the East is admired by the Western Church for its gloriousness and revered for its antiquity. The language which is vernacular to-day in the streets of Athens and is understood by the people when they hear it chanted in the

liturgies was from the beginning, from the Apostles and Evangelists, from the first three centuries of our religion's existence, the great intellectual language of nascent Christianity. It yet is, as it always has been, a superb vehicle for theological and philosophical thought. Why may it not some time again, beside its younger Christian sister, the Latin, come into its proper activity as an ideal medium over the whole world? Like Latin, it is a Roman language, having, like Latin, been a great language of the Roman Empire and the Roman Church.

From Athens a Pope could communicate with all countries both by sea and over land. Greece might become a kind of sacred region whence all that is ideal and religious and churchly, as well as what is highest in science and in art, could peaceably emanate to all Christendom, to all Romandom. Hellenism would thus resume its ancient role of being the carrier of universal wisdom and universal Christianity. Why, even if the choice for the Papacy were to fall on the Orthodox incumbent of the metropolitan See of Athens, this new Pope would in every Christian sense be or become a Roman, and would by virtue of his great appointment be infallible as head of the Church. A Pope resident at Athens would be a Roman Pope living amongst that people which by all historical tradition and legitimate inheritance is perhaps the most Roman of all nations.

DANIEL QUINN.

Yellow Springs, Ohio.

REGINALD POLE, PRINCE OF THE CHURCH.

III.

ON NOVEMBER 20, 1556, Cardinal Pole landed at Dover, commissioned to discharge one of the most momentous duties ever entrusted to a Papal Legate, that, namely, of reconciling an entire nation long enwrapped in heresy to the Holy See. As was befitting, he was nobly received, and Mr. Haile describes the manner of his greeting in words which almost make the ceremonial and the pageantry live again before our eyes. He tells his readers that, on the day following the Cardinal's landing, Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, and Sir Anthony Browne, Lord Montague, with one hundred horsemen, arrived with letters from the Queen and King. They were followed by a multitude of gentlemen and kinsmen of the Cardinal come to do him honor, chief among them Francis, Lord Hastings, son of Pole's niece, Catherine, daughter

of Henry Pole, Lord Montague, "a youth of most noble appearance," with an escort of fifty horsemen. By dinner time the number of arrivals had risen to more than three hundred; then came the Archdeacon of Canterbury—Nicholas Harpsfield—Dover being in that diocese—accompanied by several canons, and inquired of the Cardinal if he wished to be received by the clergy at the gates of Canterbury, in the manner usual with legates, to which he replied that until he had been received by their Majesties he wished for no ceremonials to be used. After the Legate had entertained at a splendid banquet thirty of the most eminent of those who came to greet him, the entire company rode to Canterbury. They reached the famous Cathedral city about midnight, being met at the gate by the civic officials and a group of the leading citizens eager to welcome the Pope's representative. At the door of the Archdeacon's house, where he was to lodge, he was received by torchlight, the Archdeacon welcoming him in an oration which moved many to tears. The Cardinal listened with much attention, until the speaker began to praise him, saying: "Tu es Polus qui aperis nobis polum regni coelorum . . . quamdiu abfuisti, omnia fuerunt tristia et adversa: in adventu tuo omnia rident, omnia laeta, omnia tranquilla." The Legate then interrupted him, saying that when he had praised God he had listened with pleasure, but touching his own particular he could not listen so readily, as to God alone was due all honor and glory. Next morning His Eminence dispatched Richard Pate, Bishop of Worcester, to London to acquaint the King and Queen with his arrival and to ascertain their wishes as regards his future proceedings. Meantime he moved on to Sittingbourne and thence to Rochester, being everywhere greeted with the utmost enthusiasm. At the latter place he was magnificently entertained by Lord Cobham in his palatial residence. Here shortly arrived Dr. Pate, bearing an answer from their Majesties inviting him to come to London and requesting that he would henceforward display the accustomed insignia of his legateship. From Rochester to Gravesend on the Thames the Cardinal's progress was a veritable triumph, upwards of one thousand of the nobility and gentry of the districts through which he passed riding in his train.

At Gravesend the Cardinal was met by the Queen's state barge and a deputation of high officials, both secular and ecclesiastical, charged to convey him to Westminster. Here he was received in the most gracious fashion by the King and Queen—the latter, according to the custom of the time, kissing him on both cheeks. In connection with this reception Mr. Haile recalls one of the saddest incidents in the poor Queen's sad reign, saying: "And here we are able to correct a legend which has long been current and

often repeated, that Pole on his arrival had, with startling irreverence, saluted the Queen in the words of the Angel Gabriel, 'Hail, full of grace,' to which she is supposed to have made answer, in the words of St. Elizabeth, that at the salutation 'the child had leapt in her womb.' By the foregoing account, written the following day by one of the Cardinal's suite, walking near enough to hear every word that passed, we have the true story, with the grain of truth at the bottom from which such legends generally spring. Pole, in answer to Mary's apologies, gracefully answered that the delay might be considered fortunate if it gave him occasion to say: 'Benedictus fructus ventris tui.' He had, in fact, been informed by the Bishop of Ely at Brussels that the Queen had hopes of an heir. In the throne room, under the dais, the sovereigns and the Legate stood, while the latter presented the breves of his legation, and then Lord Paget presented all the members of Pole's suite to their Majesties. Finally, in the same order as before, he was conducted to the river, where he took barge for Lambeth Palace, the Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Alva accompanying him, and the former going with him to his room, where they remained some time in conversation. He was then left to repose, which was before long interrupted by the advent of Lord Paget with a message from the Queen to the effect that up to this time she had refused to admit her condition, but that now she had no doubt of it, and that the Privy Council would write to the Bishop of London that the *Te Deum* might be sung in all the churches of the diocese. In fact, one of the last and the most piteous of poor Mary Tudor's many woes had come upon her: the delusive hope of an heir to her throne, hailed as the happiest promise for the future peace and quiet of the realm."

It is, of course, well known that the Queen long cherished this belief, while all the time she was really suffering from the disease—dropsy—which eventually caused her death. At Lambeth, Pole was housed in the palace, which Henry VIII. had done much to render a truly regal residence. Early on the 25th of November the King, clad in scarlet, with a number of the courtiers, both Spanish and English, engaged in a mock tournament in honor of the Legate. Everywhere there were signs of rejoicing, for the heart of the nation was glad. On Wednesday, the 28th, in consequence of a royal message, the Lords and Commons repaired to the court, and, after a few words from the Chancellor, Pole rose to explain his mission to England. He spoke "without any study as it seemed," wrote John Elder, who received notes from one who was present and who sent a summary of the speech to Lord Robert Stuard, Bishop of Caithness:

"My lords all, and you that are the Commons of this present Parliament assembled, which in effect is nothing but the state and body of the whole realm. . . . Before I enter to the particularities of my commission, I have somewhat to say touching myself, and to give most humble and hearty thanks to the King and Queen's Majesty, and after this to you all, who of a man exiled and banished from this commonwealth, have restored me to a member of the same: so of a man having no place neither here nor elsewhere within this realm, have admitted me in place, where to speak and to be heard."

After briefly relating the history of Christianity in England from the time of the ancient Britons, the Legate proceeded:

"This I protest to you, my commission is not of prejudice to any person. I come not to destroy, but to build; I am not come to call anything into question, already done. But my commission is of grace and clemency to such as will receive it. For touching all matters that be past, they shall be as things cast into the sea of forgetfulness. But the mean whereby you shall receive this benefit is to revoke and repeal those laws and statutes which be impediments, blocks and bars to the execution of my commission. . . . You cannot receive the benefit and grace offered you by the Apostolic See until the abrogation of such laws by which you have disjoined and dissevered yourselves from the unity of Christ's Church."

The Chancellor, having first taken the orders of the King and Queen, replied that the two houses would deliberate apart and signify their determination on the following morning. The motion for the reunion was carried almost by acclamation. In the House of Lords not a single dissenting voice was raised, while in the House of Commons only two members objected. On the day following the decision of the two houses their petition to the King and Queen to authorize the reconciliation of England to the Holy See was received by their Majesties in Westminster Hall—the historic edifice which has witnessed and still witnesses so many royal pageants. The scene witnessed therein is graphically described by Mr. Haile, who says that under a richly embroidered dais of gold upon gold, Queen Mary took her seat, with her husband on her left and Pole on her right, but at a little further distance. Another act of Philip's courtesy occurred as the Legate's suite arrived at the hall, and only those who carried the emblems of his legation prepared to follow him in; seeing which the King hurriedly sent the Duke of Alva to bid all the members enter. Every one being in place, the Chancellor rose and asked the consent of the two houses to present their petition to the King and Queen, which was

agreed to with a universal shout; this being done and the petition returned, the sovereigns rose and turning to the Legate, the Queen, speaking in English, asked, in her own name and that of the King, for absolution and reunion to the Church, according to the tenor of the petition.¹ The Legate then caused one of his suite to read the Bull and the Papal Brief of his legation; after which, in moving terms of affectionate congratulation, he delivered a short discourse preparatory to imparting the plenary absolution. At this moment the King and Queen rose, and the whole assembly with them, and then knelt, as Pole, speaking in English, so that all might understand, pronounced aloud the solemn words absolving the realm from heresy and schism and restoring the union with the Apostolic See: "In nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti," to which all present cried "Amen, Amen!" The Queen, shedding tears of joy, and the King remained on their knees awhile, as did all present, and in the uncertain light of the torches—which the shortness of the November day had caused to be brought in—tears and sobs of emotion escaped from many of the bowed and kneeling throng. A Te Deum in the King's Chapel followed, and on the next Sunday, the first of Advent, the King and the Legate attended Mass at St. Paul's in state, after which the Bishop of Winchester preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross. It was computed that more than 25,000 persons were present during the preaching of the sermon. Among these were the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, who had besought the Legate to come to St. Paul's. An observant Italian ecclesiastic in the Cardinal's suite, however, noted and wrote to Rome saying that the ceremonies at the High Mass "were but clumsily gone through, as if the habit had been lost." So long had the Mass been interdicted this was scarcely to be wondered at. Naturally, in Pole's report to the Pope of what occurred there was no reference to such incidents, but only glad tidings of the memorable events in which he had participated and which in the merciful Providence of God may yet be reënacted.

One of the most serious of the duties confided to Pole, however, remained yet to be accomplished, and it must be admitted that it was the one for which he personally had the least liking. This was that of the settlement of the question as to the ownership of the properties of the Church confiscated during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. and diverted from their original holy purpose, to be conferred on greedy courtiers or sold to base born speculators. As usual, Mr. Haile tells the story of the great Cardinal's mental trials and spiritual scruples in discharging this hardest of tasks in words which well deserve to be reproduced. He says that a

¹ An official copy of the petition is at the Vatican. *Inghilterra*, iii., f. 79.

joint committee of Lords and Commons had prepared a most important and comprehensive bill which, while jealously safeguarding the rights of the crown and the interests of the holders of Church property, restored the Papal supremacy and reëstablished the whole system of religious polity which had prevailed for so many centuries before the twentieth year of Henry VIII.² In the Lords the bill was read thrice in two days; in the Commons it was passed after a sharp debate on the third day, so that Pole could write to the Cardinal of Lorraine on the 4th of January:

"To-day the holy work of return to obedience was terminated by Parliament abrogating all laws and acts passed at the time of the schism against the authority of the Apostolic See."

Convocation had presented a petition to the crown, stating that the clergy resigned all right to those possessions of which the Church had been deprived and their readiness to acquiesce in every arrangement to be made by the Legate. Pole's decree was soon afterwards published:

I. That all cathedral churches, hospitals and schools founded during the schism should be preserved.

II. That all persons who had contracted marriage within the prohibited degrees without dispensation should remain married.

III. That all judicial processes made before the ordinaries or in appeal before delegates should be held valid.

IV. That the possessors of Church property should not, either now or hereafter, be molested, under pretense of any canons or councils, decreeing of Popes, or censures of the Church; for which purpose, in virtue of the authority vested in him, he took from all spiritual courts and judges the cognizance of these matters and pronounced beforehand all such processes and judgments invalid and of no effect.

Pole had an arduous task, and, as he wrote to Cardinal Morone, there was so much and such great disorder, and the body of the kingdom was so infirm, that to apply a remedy to the abuses and irregularities introduced of late "*res non est parvi consilii et magni laboris*," and also requires much time. It will be done with the help of the Bishops, who show themselves ready to do their duty in the matter.

² The Pope's jurisdiction was comprised under the following heads: 1. He was acknowledged as chief Bishop of the Christian Church, with authority to reform and redress heresies, errors and abuses within the same. 2. To him belonged the institution or confirmation of Bishops-elect. 3. He could grant to clergymen licenses of non-residence, and permission to hold more than one benefice, with care of souls. 4. He dispensed with the canonical impediments of matrimony. 5. He received appeals from the spiritual courts.—Lingard, V., p. 224.

Pole's admirable tact and temper were never more successful than in his dealings with the Bishops; some of them, like Tunstall and Gardiner, the friends of his youth, who had fallen more or less deeply into schism, and were now eager to redeem the past; all of whom, under his guidance and example during the short space of four years, were so to strengthen themselves in courage and fortitude, that of the sixteen men who filled the sees of England at Elizabeth's accession, only one, Kitchin of Llandaff, was found ready to acknowledge her spiritual supremacy—the other fifteen dying in prison or in exile.

Meantime Pole was being urgently pressed by both the King and Queen to accept the office of Archbishop of Canterbury, rendered vacant by the deposition of Cranmer, because of his obstinate heresy and undeniable disloyalty to his sovereign. The Cardinal, on the other hand, was equally earnestly imploring the Pope not to lay this new burden on his shoulders and avowing his willingness to serve the Holy See anywhere outside his native land. Decision of the question was not, however, to rest with the reigning Pontiff, because, on the 25th of March, 1555, His Holiness Julius III. died, and in the conclave which followed Pole was very nearly been elected Pope in his stead. Eventually, however, the choice of the Cardinals proved to be Cardinal Cervini, who had been one of his colleagues at the Council of Trent and who ascended the Papal throne under the title of Marcellus II. The decision of the conclave caused Pole heartfelt joy. Indeed, the news seems to have assisted his recovery from a serious illness which, for some days, led his physicians to despair of his recovery. All the time serious disorders, promoted by the enemies of the Church, were taking place in London and the provinces, and it was already abundantly apparent that the advocates of schism and heresy were plotting to bring about as speedily as they could an overthrow of the happy settlement so recently accomplished. After a reign of only twenty-two days Pope Marcellus died, and once again there arose the question of Pole being elected Pope. This, however, was precisely what he least desired, and finally the Archbishop of Naples, Cardinal Caraffa, was chosen. His Holiness assumed the title of Paul IV. One of the first to offer his congratulations to the new Pontiff was Cardinal Pole, while at the same time he solicited instructions as to the continuance of his legateship in England. At this time he was mainly engaged at Calais as a kind of Envoy Extraordinary from England in fruitless effort to secure a reconciliation between France and Spain, the ceaseless intrigues and moves and counter-moves of the sovereigns of which were fertile sources of evil to the interests of religion. Worst of all, Papal diplomacy almost

inevitably became a kind of reflection of the methods adopted by the two powers named, because as both in turn were found willing enough as occasion seemed to demand to play into the hands of the heretics so successive Pontiffs were virtually compelled to make their alliances and policy mainly dependent on the whims of either or both. It is easy enough now for hostile critics to find fault with the action and policy of the Papacy at the time in question and to discover in them inconsistencies and seeming contradictions, but—regarded as a whole—they seem to us to have been both astute and successful enough so far as their main purpose was concerned—that of the preservation of the integrity of the Church. Under such conditions, however, it is little to be wondered at that Pole's mission as a peacemaker proved as unsuccessful as on his part it was well-intentioned. Simultaneously popular feeling in England was rising higher and higher against King Philip and his Spanish courtiers and followers, some of whom were slain in desperate conflicts in the streets of London. As time went on and it became more and more apparent that the Queen would not bear him an heir, Philip's desire to return to Spain grew and strengthened.

Immediately after the accession of the new Pope an English embassy had been dispatched to Rome to convey the congratulations of Philip and Mary, the envoys being received with much ceremony at the Vatican. The ambassadors were present at the Pontiff's first consistory on the 10th of June, 1555, when in the presence of the assembled Cardinals they humbly confessed the sins of their nation and implored pardon of all its manifold faults. Then, as Mr. Haile tells us, the Pope raised them from their knees, embraced them and in their persons received the whole nation into his favor. So great was the Pope's satisfaction that he wrote to the King and Queen an account of the audience he had given their ambassadors, adding that he ratified whatever the English Legate had done, and, as far as might be necessary, had enacted it anew. There was nothing which either their Majesties or himself could do, added the Pontiff, for Pole's honor and emolument, but what was inferior to his probity and other virtues, and to what he deserved of him, of the Holy See, of their Majesties and of the whole realm. The Pope, at the same time, at the request of the King and Queen, conveyed through Pole, confirmed the title of King of Ireland which Henry VIII. had taken upon himself in 1541 during the schism; and, also at Pole's suggestion, Cardinal Morone was appointed protector of the English, and Cardinal Carpi of the Irish nations. Two of the ambassadors, Lord Montague and the Bishop of Ely, left Rome after a month's stay, Karne remaining as permanent English envoy. They brought back various Bulls, one of them

being directed against the alienation of Church property. As this might have been construed as applying to the owners of Church property in England, Pole represented to the Pope the necessity of exempting England by name from its operation. Paul IV., without hesitation, issued a new Bull to that effect, which was read at Paul's Cross in September, and in the House of Commons the following month, confirming what the Cardinal Legate had done "concerning the assurance of abbey lands." But the incident may not have been without its effect on the fears of the holders of such property, especially during the interval between the arrival of the two Bulls, and which was probably enhanced by Pole's activity in regulating the restoration of Church lands made by the Queen. This was done with careful consultation of the Lords of the Council, so as to injure the Crown as little as possible, and, day by day parishes and benefices for the cure of souls received what they had been despoiled of, and hospitals, monasteries and churches were rebuilt and reestablished according to need and opportunity. Although his faculties were as ample as possible, Pole did not fail to keep the Pope informed of every step he took. It can scarcely be necessary to say that the action of the Pontiff in recognizing the sovereignty of the King and Queen over Ireland was to strengthen their authority in reestablishing the Church in full freedom and prosperity in that country. Meantime the death of the mother of Charles V., whom he loved passionately, determined him to abdicate and to pass the remainder of his life in a monastery in atonement for his past transgressions, among which must be included several coquettings and even actual alliances with the heretic leaders on the Continent whenever his designs for the attainment of universal domination ran counter to Papal policy.

Again, we cannot do better than rely on Mr. Haile for an account of what happened. We are told that as it was Mary had again to suffer for the Emperor. In complete disregard for her feelings he commanded his son to come away from England, as he had commanded him to go and marry her a year before. Philip broached the subject of his departure adroitly, and obtained her reluctant consent; he left the greater part of his household, trying to convince her by as many signs as possible that he purposed returning speedily; "but," reported Michiel, "it is said on the contrary, more than ever, that he will go to Spain, and remove his household and everything else by degrees." In the same letter the shrewd observer remarks with regard to the restitution of Church property by the Crown:

"Certain noblemen endeavored to thwart it, perhaps from unwillingness to be incited by this example (for they can neither be

compelled nor molested) to do the like . . . and thus spontaneously disburden their consciences."

On the 22d of August the King and Queen, with the Legate, dined in London on their way to Greenwich. St. Bartholomew's fair was going on as they rode through London, and the populace who, owing to Mary's long seclusion, had thought her dead, seeing her once again among them, and in better plight than ever, gave her a most enthusiastic reception, "running from one place to another, as if they were crazy, to make sure that it was her; and displaying their joy with shouts and salutations." The King and Pole, who rode on her either hand, partook of the warmth of the reception, "both of them," says Michiel, "being popular by reason of the reported kindness of their nature, of which daily proof is afforded by facts." Shortly before his departure, Philip sent for the Legate and all the lords of the Council, and in very suitable language, which surprised everybody by its tact and judgment, recommended the government of the country to them, and then, turning to Pole, besought him very earnestly, in his own name and the Queen's, to assume the special care of the Queen and the supervision of the Council's proceedings.

The charge could not have been left in better hands, but the truth is that Pole had still a great deal of work before him ere it could be safely affirmed that he had fully accomplished the task he had come to England to perform. Mr. Haile says that on the 4th of November the Cardinal opened a synod at Westminster of the Bishops of England; not only, as he wrote to Philip II., on account of the reform of the English Church, which was ardently desired by all good men, but also that he might ratify what the Bishops and clergy had done in convocation. As the synod could not be summoned by the Primate (Cranmer), who was in prison, nor by the chapter, whilst their Archbishop was neither condemned nor deposed, it was necessary that the summons should be made by Pole as Legate by a warrant under the great seal in order that the decrees might come out with proper authority. Pole expressed himself as well pleased with the Bishops and clergy of the two provinces of Canterbury and York who assembled in the King's Chapel, Westminster, and under his guidance, which his experiences at the Council of Trent rendered in the highest degree wise and enlightened, proceeded with the work of reform. He and all men considered them exemplary in doctrine; they resided habitually in their dioceses, and by preaching, lecturing and teaching, failed not in any way to use all diligence. The first act of the synod was to decree that the 30th of November, the feast of St. Andrew, should be for ever kept as a day of rejoicing, with processions

and prayers, to celebrate the reconciliation of the realm with the Catholic Church. Accordingly, on the morrow of the feast, Machyn tells us in his diary:

"Was received with procession my Lord Cardinal Pole into Westminster Abbey; and there met him ten (eight) Bishops and the Bishop of York did minister with his mitre, and they went a procession about the Church and the cloister."

Not only did Pole call a synod for the reform of the Church, but he had already, in January, called to his aid one of the greatest theologians of his acquaintance, Father Soto, from Augsburg, writing to the Cardinal of that see that he greatly wished for him as coöperator in England, where the crop of revilers of religion abounded. Soto was wished for, not only by his own countrymen, but by many Englishmen also, and until he arrived Pole would have no rest. Soto came, and in the month of November was at Oxford, engaged in earnest controversy with the three imprisoned men, Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. From him Pole heard how much the study of theology had become neglected at the university, no works of the kind being publicly expounded, and he suggested that it would be useful to appoint an interpreter of the doctrine of Pietro Lombardo. Having hastened to communicate this to the Chancellor, Pole treated with the Queen for the exchange of the Hebrew scholarship, which had few or no pupils, for a theological one, in such wise as to cause no detriment to the former professor. On the 12th of November died Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester and Lord Chancellor of England. After much deliberation and anxious inquiry Pole recommended Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, as the most fitting occupant of the office of Chancellor.

At a consistory held in Rome on Wednesday, December 4, 1555, Cranmer was declared deprived of his position of Archbishop of Canterbury and permission given to hand him over to the secular to be tried for his misdeeds. In the same consistory the Pope announced his desire that Pole should succeed the deposed prelate in the See of Canterbury and the choice was unanimously approved. In writing the same day to congratulate his old friend, Morone adds that the whole college competed with the Pope in bestowing these praises, and that His Holiness, moreover, raised Pole from the list of Cardinal deacons to that of Cardinal priests. Morone prays that God, who has called Pole to this toil, will increase His gifts to him, so that the appointment may conduce to the salvation of souls and to the Divine glory—as is universally expected. In returning his thanks to the Pope for the Bulls of his election to the See of Canterbury, Pole declares that although in truth the

weight of the charge at first alarmed him, and he would not of his own accord have accepted it, the recommendation of the princes and the persons who approved his election, the cure of souls in his own country—naturally most dear to him—prevented him from daring by the slightest word to refuse the burden. It must be remembered that so far the Cardinal had not been raised to the priesthood and that his ordination now became a matter of necessity. This took place on Friday, March 20, 1556, in the church of the Grey Friars at Greenwich, and on the following Sunday, the 22d, he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in the same edifice. The Queen and the entire court were present at the latter function. The consecrating prelates were the Archbishop of York, Bonner, Bishop of London, and five Bishops of Canterbury province.

On the day previous, March 21, Cranmer was burned at Oxford. He had been under sentence of death for high treason for two years, his execution being postponed again and again, chiefly at the intercession of the Legate. The letter, in which with ineffable tenderness and compassion for the miserable man's soul, Pole calls God to witness that he would prefer rescuing him to all the honors and emoluments which could befall any one in this life, also contains one of the most complete and learned pieces of controversy imaginable on the doctrine of the Eucharist, at the same time laying bare all the heinousness and the disastrous effects of Cranmer's crimes against religion and against his sovereign.^a It had been written on Cranmer's expressing a wish for a personal interview with the Legate, and by Gardiner's orders had been translated into English and published, as Pole informs the Nuncio at Brussels in a letter of October 25, adding:

"Perhaps, had I known what Father Soto wrote to Monsignor Priuli, despairing of the salvation of that unfortunate man, I would not have sent it; although one can never despair whilst life remains, for sometimes the grace of God comes with the departing of the spirit, and thus, if not before, do I hope that of His infinite mercy it may come to pass with regard to this man."

The Venetian Ambassador reports in his dispatch of March 24 that Cranmer had been put to death:

"Having fully verified the opinion formed of him by the Queen, that he had feigned recantation, thinking thus to save his life . . . so she considered him unworthy of pardon and, immediately on hearing that there was no remedy and that he must die, relapsing into his usual heresies, he retracted in public all that he had uttered and signed with his own hand."

^a The original letter, written in Latin, is in the Bibliothèque Nationale; a French translation is in Le Grand's "*Histoire du Diverce*," from whence it was inserted in Quirini.—*Poli Epp.*, V., p. 238.

After the death of Cranmer followed the other executions for offenses similar to his which are long matters of history, but it appears certain that Pole was so much opposed to the policy of which they were the outcome that his own orthodoxy was even questioned by the advocates of rigorous methods. The Cardinal's period of labor in England and on earth was now, however, drawing to a close. In June, 1557, the Pope, to the great indignation of Queen Mary, withdrew his appointment as Legate, and Mr. Haile records that the King and Queen, the Privy Council and the Bishops having appealed in vain to Paul IV., Mary, with characteristic promptitude, sent orders to Calais that no messenger from Rome should be permitted to come to England, and that all letters and dispatches from there should be brought to her; she took care also that the whole affair should remain a secret to the Legate and to Peto, while she sent an express to Rome, with orders to her Ambassador, Karne, to tell the Pope that his late proceedings were utterly destructive of whatever had been done towards recalling the ancient faith in England. Finally, she called both God and men to witness she was not accessory to the evils, which could not fail to ensue, if he persisted in his resolution.

On the 17th of November, 1558, Queen Mary died, and on the night of the same day Cardinal Pole, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, expired, but not before he had received tidings of her demise. A description of the closing hours of his holy life, written by his devoted friend, Priuli, has been preserved. It reads as follows:

"After remaining silent a short time, he said to his intimate friend, the Bishop of St. Asaph (Goldwell), and to me that in the whole course of his life nothing had yielded him greater happiness and content than the contemplation of God's providence as displayed in his own person and in that of others, and that in the course of the Queen's life and of his own he had even remarked a great uniformity, as she, like himself, had been harassed many years for one and the same cause, and afterwards, when it pleased God to raise her to the throne, he had greatly participated in all the other troubles entailed by that elevation.

"He also alluded to their relationship and to the great similarity of their dispositions *gran conformità d'anime*, and to the confidence Her Majesty displayed in him, saying that besides the immense mischief which might result from her death, he could not help feeling deep grief thereat, yet, by God's grace, the same faith in Divine Providence which had ever comforted him greatly consoled him now in this so grievous a final catastrophe.

"He uttered these words with such earnestness that it was evident they came from his very heart, and they even moved him to tears.

. . . His Right Rev. Lordship then remained silent for about a quarter of an hour; but though his spirit was great, the blow having entered the flesh, brought on the paroxysm earlier, and with more intense cold than he had hitherto experienced, so that he said he felt it would be his last. He therefore desired that the book containing the prayers for the dying might be placed near him. He then had Vespers said as usual . . .; and this was about two hours before sunset. . . . In fine, it was evident that as in health that sainted soul was ever turned towards God, so likewise in this long and troublesome infirmity did it continue thus until his end, which he made so placidly that he seemed to sleep rather than to die; as did the Queen likewise, so that had not a physician perceived the act, Her Majesty would have died without any one's knowing of it (*senza che alcuno se ne avedesse.*)"

WALTER F. DESTERRE.

CRITICISMS IN KANT.

IN THE series of articles on the Kantian philosophy which is here brought to a close we are well aware that we have more than once tried the patience of the editor of the *QUARTERLY*. The unavoidable length of some of our articles seemed to set at defiance some of the rules demanded by the exigencies of magazine publication. We can only plead in extenuation the paramount importance of the problem which we have been discussing, the necessity of dealing adequately with it and the fact that, although Kant's gigantic imposture had been before the world for more than a century and a quarter, no attempt had hitherto been made to examine into—much less to expose—the rottenness of the foundation on which the gigantic edifice had been raised. That we have exploded the glittering fallacy beyond all hope of rehabilitation we fearlessly assert. That the tangled mass of contradiction, chicanery and sophistry which has pompously styled itself "a science of metaphysic," and which, under this high-sounding title, has long imposed on the world, has been so completely exposed as to be utterly harmless in the future, no one with a mind capable of grasping the nature of the problems at issue will, we think, for a moment question. The gravity of the questions which formed the subject matter of our discussion must, then, be our apology for having occasionally overstepped the limits of the regulation

magazine article. Grave metaphysical problems which reach down to the very root of human knowledge necessarily entail elaborate exposition, unbroken continuity of thought and uninterruptedly sustained argument. Indeed for this reason it is an open question whether the discussion of deep metaphysical problems is not altogether out of place in a magazine devoted to miscellaneous subjects. We live in an age that can hardly be rated as unduly intellectual, and this western portion of the world is not overmuch given to very deep thought; hence the metaphysical article is apt to be eyed askance by the ordinary reader of even such a magazine as the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*. Not infrequently does it require rare courage on the part of an editor to introduce the philosophical article at all, and that its appearance is even tolerated is, for the most part, due to his good judgment and sound sense. However, it behooves him to be cautious, and he must not presume too greatly on the temper of his readers.

For this reason the present article presents a somewhat mutilated appearance—perhaps an abrupt front. The explanation is that the main body of it formed originally an integral part of the article of the same title, published in the January number of the present year, and was intended to be the closing words of that article and with it the closing article of the series. In order, therefore, to understand its full significance, it should be read in connection with that article, which, without it, is somewhat incomplete. We have enclosed in brackets all of the present article, which originally constituted a portion of the previous article. In this way the philosophical reader who is sufficiently interested will be able to make the necessary connection.

At the same time we do not regret the division, for it gives us the opportunity of introducing at the close of this article the suggestions regarding the basis of a new philosophy, to which we alluded in our last article, and to which otherwise we might not return for a long time; but which, we think, should be made clear. Able minds over in Europe are at present grappling with the question. We have not seen the suggestions which we submit broached anywhere; yet they seem to us of the greatest importance; for, if they do nothing else, they will give us a clear survey of the present field of philosophy, or at least of the theory of knowledge, as it exists to-day. We append them in brief at the close of this article.

In our former article on the deduction of the Categories we showed how Kant sought [shades of darkness under cover of which to make substitution of terms and confuse one with the other. We have followed him into the impenetrable recesses and from his own

words shown how he has endeavored to palm off spurious proofs for genuine ones. We have shown that he has accomplished the very opposite of what he set out to prove. Claiming that his categories are prior to and independent of all experience, it has been seen that the upshot of his deduction is exactly the opposite of all this; that is, that apart from experience—of which they were so independent—his categories, according to Kant's own admission, are nothing. What is all this but deriving them from experience? The complete transformation which Kant's categories undergo, in his Transcendental Deduction of them, recalls Dante's vision, in *Malebolge*, of the encounter between a serpent and a human form—a vision which Lord Macaulay delighted to quote. A cloud partially enveloped the combatants, and, in the uncertain light, each is transformed into the likeness of its antagonist. The serpent's tail divides and becomes two legs; the man's legs unite and become a tail. Arms spring from the breast of the serpent; the man's arms shrink into his body. The serpent stood up a man and spake; the man glided hissing away. With Kant the encounter is between the categories and experience, but the result is the same. At first the categories were independent of experience. They gave experience its forms. Without them there could be no such thing as experience. They made experience possible. But in the final issue the transformation is complete. Experience becomes master. It dictates its laws to the categories, and the very existence of the categories depends on experience. Such, then, are Kant's conclusions from his deduction of the categories. The arguments of his deduction are curious and interesting, but the reverse of conclusive.

As we have said, Kant courted the darkness; and when his dark, mysterious rites were performed, he opened the door and invited men to glance into the gloom, where, having perceived something—they knew not what—in the obscurity, they accepted Kant's words for it, that this was his hypothesis proven. The careful reader, however, will at last discover that, after much tautological discussion—which always ends where it began—about the unity of self-consciousness and the unity of apperception, all Kant's efforts are a mere attempt to prove one of two things—now it is one, now the other—either that the categories must refer to objects from their very nature—thus making them wholly dependent on experience of which they were supposed to be wholly independent—or that they are conditions of thought in every operation of the mind—a truism which Aristotle established nearly twenty-three hundred years ago. Kant really gives us two deductions: that of the first and that of the second edition. The value of his first deduction—that is, the deduction in his first

edition, is of such importance that, as we have seen, he omits it, and never even alludes to it, in the second edition; and in the second edition the deduction is a genuine philosophical curiosity. We regret we have no room to reproduce it here; for it is a rare specimen. Here, too, however, the only attempt that is made is to show that the objective validity of the categories consists in their application to the objects of experience, which is not a transcendental deduction at all—to say nothing of not proving their objective validity—but an empirical deduction.

Before leaving this portion of the deduction of the categories let us say that, prescinding wholly from Kant's failure to establish the truth of his Copernican theory, there is, it seems to us, one consideration that must necessarily frustrate all Kant's claims that the categories are subjective and not objective. It is this: If the categories are forms of the understanding, already prepared in the mind for the reception of experience and there lying in wait for experience; and if all experience must conform to these forms of the understanding; or, as Kant himself puts it, if they give laws to all nature and impress their forms on the physical world, why is it that we can never substitute one category for another? Phenomena are shapeless, formless and void, according to Kant, until they come into contact with these forms of the mind. If, then, it is a matter of no consequence as far as objects are concerned, what form they assume, is it not passing strange that we can never substitute one category in its relation to objects for another? But, no; we cannot. Where there is cause there is always cause. Where there is unity there is always unity. Where there is substance there is always substance. Where there is reality there is always reality. It does not seem to be a matter of indifference whether in an object we perceive substance and accident and not cause and effect. We never can apply unity to objects where they demand cause and effect. If the categories were wholly in the mind waiting for phenomena or objects, it would evidently be a matter of little consequence whether a ship, instead of presenting to us unity and divisibility, should not give us cause and effect instead, or whether water or fire should primarily present to us the categories of unity and plurality instead of substance and accident. Nothing is more certain than that the categories are as closely connected with their objects as form is with substance; whereas, if the Kantian hypothesis were true, we should be able to transpose and apply the categories of cause, and substance and unity, and all the others indiscriminately. Manifestly, then, the objects themselves have a preference; and if they have, this simple fact overthrows Kant's Copernican discovery. Kant himself seems to have

suspected this; for in no other way can we interpret his remark that, "With all this it remains perfectly undetermined what kind of things they may be with regard to which we have to use one rather than another of these functions, so that, without the condition of sensuous intuition, for which they supply the synthesis, the categories have no relation to any definite object, cannot define any object, and consequently have not the validity of objective concepts." This, it seems to us, can have but one meaning, viz., that Kant, too, realized that with "regard to them (the categories) we have to use one rather than another of these functions." Possibly Kant refers here to phenomena and noumena, but the context would seem to indicate that he was referring to the categories themselves. However that may be, this simple fact is fatal to Kant's theory. The categories cannot belong exclusively to the mind. Objects must have at least some determining power as to which of the categories are applicable to them. And this simple fact explodes Kant's theory. Indeed, nothing could be more rash—not to say ridiculous—than to say that our knowledge is limited by the categories as to the possibility of its extent, and that if, instead of five senses, we had seven or ten, our minds are not equipped with the necessary faculties or powers to grapple with the additional knowledge which our new experience would introduce to us. Yet this is practically what Kant maintains when he undertakes to tell us that the categories belong to the mind only and that they are for use only in experience. After all has been said by Kant he has not alleged one single fact or brought forward one single argument calculated to convince a reasonable man that the categories are forms of the understanding merely, and consequently wholly subjective. All that Kant has said does not warrant him—or any one else—in maintaining a stronger proposition with regard to the categories than the old and trite one, which the most ignorant as well as the most learned of human beings will be ready to endorse, viz., that the human mind has the faculty of knowledge and is so constituted that it is capable of a knowledge of things external to itself. All Kant's transcendental deductions and transcendental æsthetic bring him not one single step in advance of this. For the rest; in his deduction of the categories Kant is forever oscillating between two points, either of which is fatal to his theory. He is either proving that intuition, or experience, or sensibility, is always necessary to prove the objective reality of the categories, which he erroneously calls their transcendental deduction; or else he is showing that they are conditions of thought in all experience, as if this were a new discovery. In the former case he is simply making the categories

—in spite of all his contention—dependent on experience; in the second he is taking a world of pains to prove what is the baldest and most threadbare of facts. Between these two points, nevertheless, Kant's transcendental deduction of his categories constantly swings, but never gets beyond them.

In this necessarily imperfect sketch of the deduction of the categories let us briefly indicate what we have seen. (1) That Kant's primary duty was to show the objective reality of these categories in his interpretation of them; that is, to show that they possess, as he claims, a real existence as forms of the understanding. (2) That in this he has so utterly failed that he did not even make the attempt to do it directly—although he attempted to do it surreptitiously. (3) That Kant confounds this objective reality with the transcendental deduction of the categories, while they are as essentially different as night and day. (4) That even were the propositions identical, Kant has utterly failed to give us a transcendental deduction of the categories, showing merely (a) either that they refer the understanding to objects, thus deducing them empirically, or (b) showing them to be conditions of thought in all experience, which no one has ever denied. In any case, he has not given us a transcendental deduction of the categories, much less any proof whatever, that the categories are, as he claims, purely subjective. (5) That Kant himself has declared that apart from sensibility—that is, from experience—these categories have no objective validity and have no existence the meaning of which any one can understand. And this is simply making them dependent on experience. (6) That although Kant declared that his first deduction of the categories was the only possible one, he rejected it in his second edition and adopted another. (7) That no argument which Kant alleges to prove that his categories belong exclusively to the mind can be found which will not apply with equal force to show that they belong to the object or are abstractions from experience. So much, then, for the deduction of the categories. Kant has, therefore, utterly failed to prove his hypothesis; and the arguments against it are incontrovertible.

We have, however, already seen in a former article that, after all, it is a matter of little consequence whether or no Kant has been able to show that his categories are purely subjective and intended only for experience; for here again he commits an intellectual suicide, and is ever between the horns of a fatal dilemma. He maintains that all our knowledge must be empirical; but our empirical knowledge he makes rest on a *priori* knowledge which can never be empirical; this *a priori* knowledge is the categories.

He thus cuts away the ground on which all empirical knowledge is supposed to rest; and this, too, without being aware of what he was doing. Then, on the other hand, there is not one single claim put forward by Kant in behalf of his categories that does not apply with equal force and equal validity, whether we take the categories in the Kantian sense, or in the Aristotelian sense, or in the Lockian. Hence with regard to the objective reality of his categories, Kant has proved nothing, and throughout his entire philosophy he is hoist with his own petard.

All attempts to refute Kant have been heretofore so many failures, more or less for the reason, as it seems to us, that so few have grasped the real Kantian position as a whole. The way to overthrow a citadel is to undermine the foundations. Little can be accomplished by a scattering fusillade which breaks some plaster here and there, or even carries away a cap or a crown from a flying buttress. For this reason the only way to deal successfully with Kant is to attack his entrenched position. Kant's plan is very simple when we come to understand it, although it rambles over much territory. We shall give a brief summary of the Kantian scheme for the benefit of the student of Kant who may have been at sea with regard to what it all means. First, Kant makes the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the human will, *the* problems of metaphysic. He perceived—like every one else—that these truths can never have an empirical demonstration. This suggested to him that there was a difference between our knowledge of these truths and our empirical knowledge; hence he attempted to set up his everlasting barriers between these two kinds of knowledge and establish empirical knowledge as the only kind of knowledge. In this, however, he found himself confronted by the Cartesian problem, which discredited empirical knowledge, and at least contended with it for the first rank, where Kant would fain place it—and it alone. For the purpose of restoring empirical knowledge to the first place, and establishing it there as the only knowledge deserving of the position, it was necessary that he be able to connect the mind with the empirical reality or the external world. For this purpose he seized upon the Aristotelian categories as the only instruments by which he could accomplish his design. They, in their various forms, entered into every kind of knowledge, and he believed that if he could show that these belonged not to objects or to experience, but to the mind—the faculty of knowledge—and that through them alone we could have knowledge or experience, his task was accomplished and victory awaited him. If he could show that the mind has certain forms or moulds to which objects must

conform, and which are for use only in experience; and if he could establish this beyond peradventure, it would be an epoch-making discovery in the history of human knowledge. But how to do this? And, by way of accomplishing it, Kant gave us the transcendental deduction of the categories. It was an arduous task; but Kant declared that he had "succeeded." (Kant failed to perceive, meanwhile, that this new discovery was, as a piece of human knowledge, quite as incapable of becoming empirical as is the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, and that consequently his herculean labors, even had he proved the truth of his theory, were wholly in vain; for on this knowledge that never could be empirical all our empirical knowledge was made by Kant to rest.) Kant's next point was to show that we can have no knowledge whatever except through the categories; that as these categories—since they were forms existing in the mind for the purpose of relating it with objects—were intended only for objects of experience, they could not be applied to objects that never could be met with in experience. They could, therefore, have no application to such subjects as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the human will, and, consequently, these doctrines could never come within the scope of human knowledge at all. Evidently Kant forgot that his categories, upon which he was basing all his dogmatism, were open precisely to the same objection. Thus the categories are at once the prop and the pride, the foundation and the crown of the Kantian philosophy. To buttress his doctrine of the categories he was obliged to establish his doctrines of space and time and also his philosophy of the phenomena and noumena; but all of them merely go to establish his doctrine of the categories, and are therefore subsidiary. Kant's conclusion is that we can know only phenomena, and that all our knowledge is merely empirical. Hence we can have nothing like knowledge of the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the human will; and to show this was the end and aim of all Kant's labors in the "Critique of Pure Reason."

It will be easily seen, therefore, that any attempt to refute Kant by merely attacking his distinction between phenomena and noumena, or by simply assailing his antinomies, or by other flank assaults, leaves his central position intact, and that the only way to overthrow Kant's philosophy is to show the utter worthlessness of its foundations. This is what we have tried to do in the articles which are here brought to a close. Volumes, however, not articles, would be required to deal adequately with Kant's boundless sophistry. We have shown the weakness of Kant's philosophy as one supposedly great organic whole. We have dealt merely with

the fundamental principles and shown their utter futility, often even their folly. We have not touched upon either the transcendental æsthetic or the paralogisms of pure reason; first, for lack of time, and, secondly, because others have dealt, if not completely and exhaustively, at least quite efficaciously, with the transcendental æsthetic—Kant's theory of peace and time. With regard to the paralogisms of pure reason—Kant's rational psychology—since Kant has omitted it wholly in his second edition (and, per consequence, it is omitted in all subsequent editions), it is not known even to the general student of philosophy. Neither have we dealt with Kant's particular arguments; nor with the general or fundamental arguments that underlie the great plan, except in a general way. Some day, however, when we have more leisure, we may take up these particular arguments—especially the antinomies and the existence of God—and show how arbitrary and unreasoning is Kant both in his arguments and his conclusions from them. This would be merely an agreeable pastime. We think, however, that in the series of articles which closes with this we have indicated with sufficient clearness the lines along which any one can detect for himself the flaws in Kant's main argument and most of the fallacies in his collateral ones. There is much—very much—that we would like to add by way of showing how Kant's theory of knowledge is absolutely false, and by way of showing, too, what Catholic philosophy could do to clear up the situation and settle it for all time. Too many weak intellects have already been shipwrecked on the rocks that Kant's theory of knowledge has, in the great philosophical upheaval, raised above the surface. There is much work to be done. *Des Cartes* opened up problems which were unknown to the schoolmen, and the solution of which they, consequently, could not have left to us. Yet these are precisely the great questions of our time. Kant himself has introduced so much false reasoning that a moderate-sized library shelf would hardly suffice to accommodate all the books needed to answer them; and a lifetime would be too short to do justice to all of them.

Nevertheless, one parts from Kant with sincere regret. If we have the proper intellectual balance, once we have learned the key to Kant and completely mastered the Kantian system, the task of refuting him becomes comparatively easy, and there is an enjoyment in uncovering his countless fallacies that cannot be easily found in any other work. Perhaps the real charm of Kant—for with all his blunders Kant has a real charm—lies in the fact that he conducts the reader at once into the regions of pure intellect. It is not so surprising, after all, that Kant has had so many admirers. We fancy that the air-sailor, clambering aloft in the pure, im-

palpable ether, enjoys—despite every misadventure—a pleasure which is unknown to the motorist on the great modern highway or the racer on the bosom of the most ravishing water-course. In the same way it may be said that the highest form of mundane pleasure is intellectual pleasure, that the highest form of intellectual pleasure is philosophy, and that the highest form of philosophy is metaphysic. Dry and forbidding as it seems to the uninitiated, its rewards are peerless, for it is the pursuit of truth in its very highest and purest form. Intellectually, metaphysic is far in advance even of mathematics, for the latter is forced from time to time to descend to earth and yoke itself again to the senses in order to be able to check empirically the results of its intellectual and abstract reasoning. Hence, in spite of his errors, Kant will always possess a charm for the man of intellect. He dwells on the mountain peaks of human thought and philosophical speculation, far beyond the dreams of the loftiest poet; and even though he again and again becomes engulfed in the gorges of the ether on which he is so fearlessly treading, and although, when he sinks into the abysses of the unknown which he is exploring, he resorts to unconventional and illegitimate methods of self-rescue, we are compelled to admire the genius and skill with which he wrestles in the losing struggle, and wish that such powers had been enlisted on the side of truth. Indeed, if Kant's sophistications were not so obtrusive and ever present, one would feel inclined to condone to his genius his many and multiplied errors. But the truth is that, in spite of his genius and brilliant as was his attempt to revolutionize human knowledge, he has hopelessly demoralized all knowledge; and the dire result of his herculean labors has been to plunge empirical knowledge deeper and deeper into the slough from which he claimed to have rescued it.]

Here the "criticisms" of Kant—so far as the present series is concerned—end. We shall, however, take advantage of the space yet remaining and offer a few suggestions regarding the present condition of philosophy, which may at least help to clear the atmosphere and give a complete though brief survey of the whole philosophy of knowledge as it exists at the present day. This may simplify to some extent the work of those who would remould all philosophic thought and readjust it to the requirements of the age.

The great storm-centre of philosophy is to-day—and has been for more than a century—the question: What do we really know? Ever since Des Cartes introduced his methodic doubt the real value of our knowledge has been a serious problem with the philosophers. Not, however, before Kant's day did we have open rebellion and anarchy centring around the question of knowledge; for not even

the skepticism of David Hume was able to mislead the world. It remained for Kant, with his avowal of an honest purpose and his adoption of dishonest methods, to delude men's minds and completely impose on the world by his specious sophistry. Since his day we have had nothing but philosophic confusion, anarchy and riot. The advocates of the different schools now stand fiercely glaring at each other and soundly berating one another across the chasms that separate them. The sensist scoffs at the rationalist and the rationalist at the sensist, while the idealist in his turn ridicules both. It seems an almost hopeless task to attempt to unite them on any common ground or to bring order out of the universal chaos. Let us, however, go beneath the chaos and confusion, push aside the rubbish and the debris, and try to get a clear survey of the field. Without this all efforts to inaugurate a new philosophy must end in failure. We can construct no royal road—nor indeed any road at all—out of the wilderness, unless we first get the cardinal points of the compass in the chaotic region.

The real question at issue seems to be: What is the value of our human knowledge? In other words, What is knowledge? The whole difficulty in answering it arises from the fact that men insist upon a single answer; whereas in the present state of our knowledge, not one answer, but three, must be given. The idealist tells us that we really know nothing but ourselves; that is, the *ego*, the thinking subject. The empiricist tells us that our only real knowledge can come only from experience—that is, sense-experience. And finally, the rationalist (we use the term in its larger and broader meaning) tells us the conclusions of reason alone give us truth. All the disputes of philosophy in its present stage—and for the last century, for that matter—are reducible to these three. But for these three no common multiple can be found.

The idealist, then, tells the empiricist that all his vaunted knowledge—of which he so loudly boasts and upon which he lays such stress—has no value whatever. It is not knowledge at all; for it has no existence at all; or, what is the same thing, if, mayhap, it has an existence, that existence can never be proven. All external things which form the material for experience are mere appearances. All our so-called knowledge of experience is but the efflorescence of our own thought working on the background of consciousness and spinning cobwebs and phantasies which we call experience and endeavor to dignify by the name of an outer world. But all these are not more substantial than the dream I had last night. Nothing exists but the *ego*. All that we call the *not me* is but the extension of the *me* and the external world has no existence. No man can prove its existence. We can never have

the same certainty of its existence that we have of our own. Such is the claim of the idealists. And there is no denying that the empiricist is dumb and must remain so in the presence of this argument. The knowledge of his own existence differs not only in degree, but also in kind from his knowledge of the external world. Hence the knowledge—certainty—truth—of our own existence stands by itself and constitutes one kind of knowledge. Next comes the empiricist.

The sensist or empiricist tells us that our senses alone are reliable and that they alone give us knowledge properly so-called. All other kind of knowledge is negligible. All else is unprovable. The knowledge of mere reason the empiricist rejects with scorn. Let the conclusions of reason be founded on the bedrock of experience and the empiricist will deign to accept them; but apart from this they are not regarded worthy of his serious consideration. All the conclusions of reason, in order to be accepted at the bar of knowledge, must be properly authenticated by experience. Experience must verify them. When thus verified they may be accepted as knowledge and as truth; but without this process of verification such conclusions are worthless—often worse than worthless. The empiricist, however, does not care to deny the claims of the idealist and, albeit somewhat reluctantly, is forced to admit that theoretically at least his superior claims must be admitted. And lastly comes the rationalist.

The rationalist (in the wide sense of the term) maintains on his side that reason is the great criterion of knowledge and of truth. To it, he insists, both the idealist and the empiricist must appeal. Its just conclusions give unimpeachable truth. Nay, it is the only safe and sane method of arriving at the knowledge of truth. It has been forced again and again to correct the vagaries and extravagancies of sense-experience. It must work in accordance with rule and law, it is true; but when it works under the regulation of its own laws, its conclusions are unquestionable. It gives us philosophic truth in its highest form.

Here, then, are three claimants for the agency of knowledge. Each insists that it alone is a competent dispenser of knowledge and that its seal alone, and only it, is the proper authentication of truth. Its criterion—alone and no other—gives and can give us certainty. There is no other claimant in the field of philosophic truth. Which is right? Which of the three are we to believe? Can all three be correct? Is there a common multiple which will include all of them? And does truth lie with any one of them or with all three? These, it seems to us, are the questions which lie at the basis of all our philosophy, and the answers to which must be

regarded as first principles, in the condition of philosophy in our day. Let us briefly examine the credentials of each claimant.

First, with regard to the idealist, it must be admitted—however much we may deplore it—that the Cartesian problem is, by many men, held to be the rockbed of all philosophical thought. Many great names in philosophy have stood sponsor for its soundness. Nay, what is more, many able men regard doubt about the real existence of the external world as inseparable from a high degree of intellectuality. So cultured an intellect as that of Emerson does not hesitate to leave on record the astounding remark—which, after all, is not so far from the truth—that “intellectual science has been observed to beget invariably a doubt of the existence of matter.” Turgot claimed that “he that has never doubted the existence of matter may be assured he has no aptitude for metaphysical inquiries.” Cardinal Newman is said to have at a very early age doubted the existence of the external world. Therefore the question, “whether nature enjoy a substantial existence without, or is only in the apocalypse of the mind;” in other words, whether “the world is a divine dream” and nothing more, is one which by the common consent and unanimous vote of a not insignificant minority among the aristocracy of intellect has been to put it mildly, “left on the table.” Consequently this fact is one that must be reckoned with in any attempt to solve the problem of knowledge. Nor is idealism without show of justification. Man is conscious of his own existence. He is conscious of this in a way in which he is conscious of no other fact. The knowledge of self-consciousness differs not only in degree, but also in kind from our knowledge of all other phenomena. It is the one fact of which the thinking subject can be absolutely certain, and on which he can make clear affidavit. In its nature, then, it surpasses all other knowledge of whatever form. But this knowledge is barren. It leads nowhither. It produces no results. Or if it produces results theoretically, they constitute but a delirium of philosophy. The bridge across to the external world has never been built and never shall be. No one will dispute this. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the knowledge of consciousness stands on a higher plane and on a foundation essentially different from and superior to that of all other philosophical knowledge. Even the great champion of empiricism, Kant himself, was forced to admit this. The claims of the idealist, therefore, cannot be ignored.

Next comes the knowledge of the senses, or sense-experience, and its advocates—Kant especially, and, after him, Herbert Spencer—would make its claims absolute. No knowledge, no certainty, they tell us, can surpass that of experience. Experience is the

only true teacher. Nevertheless, the advocates of empiricism are compelled to admit—reluctantly enough—that the knowledge of our own existence—or the knowledge of consciousness—is both one step higher in degree and one degree stronger in kind than our knowledge from experience. It is very evident, then, that we have here two distinct kinds of knowledge without any link between them; and that the knowledge of the idealist or skeptic is superior in kind and higher in form than that of the empiricist. In other words, its certainty is greater. Like the idealist, the empiricist is forced to admit that it can construct no bridge across the abyss from the *me* to the *not me*, and consequently that we can never reinforce the knowledge of experience by the strength of the knowledge which consciousness gives. Thus the idealist holds the dogmatism of the empiricist in check and quickly silences the proud and loud boastings of his claims for the superiority of experience. For this wholesome effect let us be thankful to Cartesianism.

Next comes the rationalist, who tells us that reason alone is the true teacher. The conclusions of reason alone give us true knowledge. Reason is *ex officio* the real teacher of truth. Its duty is to investigate, to discover and to announce truth. Right reason working in accordance with its own laws cannot deceive us. Nor is this true in speculative problems only; it is true also in the practical. Never have the legitimate conclusions of reason been checked and verified and found wanting. Both the idealist and the empiricist admit the claims of reason within certain limits; but each regards its own as vastly superior. Even empiricism, the great rival—we had almost said, enemy—of reason, is forced to admit that wherever it has been able to follow up reason and verify its conclusions, these conclusions are unimpeachable. Singularly enough, however, the empiricist would fain persuade us that, while the conclusions of reason constitute a safe guide to knowledge where these conclusions can be verified by experience, it would be unsafe to follow reason where no such verification is possible. Hence, he claims, that while in practical knowledge reason is perfectly safe, in speculative philosophy it must be distrusted. Accordingly, in matters pertaining to the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will—in a word, in all problems beyond the reach of experience—it would be a mistake to trust to reason, even though she has always proved a reliable guide in matters that fall under experience; here we must distrust her. The answer to this, however, is obvious. That in the realm of speculative philosophy, the conclusions of reason do not admit of verification cannot be ascribed to reason as a fault or cannot be due to any defect of reason. The defect is wholly on the side of ex-

perience, which is unable to follow reason into this higher region. An admitted defect in the test can never be regarded as a defect in the thing tested; neither can the avowed and innate inability of the critic discredit the work criticized. The wren or the finch is unable to follow the eagle; but it would be manifest absurdity to deny that the eagle has not looked on the sun with unflinching gaze from the higher strata of air simply because the birds of lower flight are not able to follow him. The defect in experience can in no wise discredit reason. Reason can say to empiricism: Follow me and prove me false if you will. Wherever you have been able to follow me you have been able only to corroborate my conclusions. I challenge you to follow me into the higher regions and prove them false. And empiricism is unable—from sheer incapacity—to accept the challenge. That its inability to do so should in any wise redound to the discredit of reason is so preposterous that it contradicts even the most ordinary common sense. Hence reason is fully justified in maintaining the following attitude in the face of all the criticisms of sense-experience: I, reason, am preëminently the faculty of truth. My legitimate conclusions throughout the whole realm of knowledge are unimpeachable. All regions are the same to me. My mission to ascertain and dispense truth is wholly independent of your carpings and criticisms. Who has appointed you supreme arbiter of truth? At best you are nothing more than a self-appointed critic of my work and my conclusions. You have followed me for the purpose of detecting flaws wherever your own narrow limitations allowed, and wherever you have followed me, in spite of your disposition to discredit, you have been compelled to sanction and reluctantly corroborate. Since, then, in every instance in which you have been able to follow me you have been forced to verify and proclaim the truth of my claims, is it not, to say the least, presumptive evidence that my claims are wholly legitimate? The truth or falsity of my conclusions does not in any way depend on your verification which is proffered wholly gratuitously; but since you are self-appointed judge, I challenge you to follow me into the region of speculation, as you term it, and there disprove—if you can—my conclusions. And since you credit me only to obtain an opportunity of trying to discredit me—and this on the sole ground of your limitations—I thank you for nothing. If, according to your own avowal, you are not able to follow me into these regions, then, on your confession, you are a totally incompetent judge, and your sanction or contradiction are of exactly equal value here—that is, of no value at all. This is the only legitimate conclusion.

This, then, is the universal claim of reason, that from her very

nature she is the duly constituted teacher and dispenser of truth, that where experience is able to follow her it has always been forced—grudgingly enough—to confess that not only has it been unable to invalidate her claims, but has even been forced sorely against her will to verify them and prove them true beyond all question; and that since sense-experience admits its innate inability to follow reason into the higher realms of knowledge, reason can have no voice whatever either in crediting or discrediting reason in this sphere. According to his own admission, the testimony of experience is utterly valueless.

Like all busybodies, however, and all those with doubtful titles, experience—empiricism—still persists in pursuing reason in order to have her claims rejected. Since Kant's day especially, empiricism, presumptuously enough, persists in her attempt to discredit the claims of reason in the regions where experience cannot follow. It stoutly maintains that where, on account of its own limitations, experience is unable to follow, there can be proper verification of the conclusions of reason and therefore no proof of their truth. And just here comes in its own awkward dilemma for the boaster, empiricism. As it turns away in scorn from the reports of reason which the senses, because of their own shortcomings, cannot verify, and while it clamorously persists in calling for verification and proofs of these conclusions, it finds itself suddenly confronted by the idealist, who, in turn, challenges quite as peremptorily the claims of the empiricist and insists that he, in turn, furnish the proofs for the truth of *his* experience. Just as the empiricist rejects the claims of the reason until authenticated by experience, so the idealist rejects with scorn the claims of the empiricist until properly authenticated by the thinking consciousness. The report of the senses, the idealist insists, must be fully authenticated before the tribunal of consciousness—nay, the real itself must be shown to have a substantial existence—before its dogmatic assertions can be accepted as truth at all. And this authentication empiricism is unable to give. It is therefore a complete turning of the tables—to the utter discomfiture of empiricism. It is a case of the biter bitten, or of the unjust debtor of the Gospel who throttles his debtor, and is in turn throttled severely by his own creditor. But the noteworthy feature is that empiricism has no defense to make, and even admits that it has been fully cognizant all the while of its own shortcomings. Yet with this full knowledge it has had little hesitation in hectoring and browbeating and bullying reason for no offense at all. In this way Cartesianism renders excellent service to reason by the simple fact of showing empiricism how arbitrary is its standard and how slender are its grounds for lording it over anything. The dog-

matism of the empiricist is thus suddenly called to a halt and from challenging becomes the challenged and convicted—and even pleads guilty of its own accord. Nor can idealism be looked upon as a negligible quantity. “The frivolous make themselves merry with the ideal theory, as if its consequences were burlesque,” it is true. But too many men of high intellectual standing have been firm believers that culture inverts the common views of nature, and tends to imbue the mind with idealism, to permit us to dismiss it with a shrug. And what is more to the point—empiricism itself, as we have already said, is prompt in admitting that the exactions of idealism are just, and that itself is powerless to reach the idealist’s standard.

There is, then, no knowledge on whose acceptance as a standard the schools are agreed. It is well, then, for all the schools—and especially for bragging and blustering empiricism—to understand well their limitations. To do so will conduce greatly to a proper humility and will save them much unnecessary mortification and embarrassment. It is quite plain, therefore, that there is a knowledge of consciousness, a knowledge of experience and a knowledge of reason; and it is equally plain that the sterling values of the three are by no means equal. It behooves the empiricist above all to be modest in his claim; for the idealist has reason on his side when he says of the *not me*: “Be it what it may, it is ideal to me, so long as I cannot try the accuracy of my senses.” Had the agnostic been more modest in his claim or less loud in his dogmatism, he would have been spared the vexation and shame of having the weakness of his own position so completely exposed. Let us be thankful, then, for the Cartesian and his standard of knowledge. It completely silences the shallow claims of loud-voiced empiricism.

There is therefore no standard of knowledge on which all the schools are agreed—and there never will be. This must be fully recognized before we can take a single step in the work of reconstructing philosophy. We are here standing on the bedrock on which the true foundations of philosophy must be laid. Building without due recognition of the essential distinction between the rival claims would be simply to build on shifting sands. We must not forget that each school has—and in all probability will always have—many and powerful adherents. Due recognition of the claims of each school is therefore an absolute necessity if we are to have a philosophy that is to unite the now warring clans. Indeed, the distinction and the difference in the claims of each must be accepted as among our first principles and dealt with accordingly. We see that while empiricism challenges the claims of reason, idealism quite as peremptorily, and with far more justice, challenges the

claims of empiricism. There must be a due recognition of the legitimate claims of each and a proper adjustment of these claims, assigning to each its full value and allotting to each its own territory, over which its jurisdiction is supreme. Above all, must it be clearly established and duly emphasized that, in view of the conflicting claims and the arguments adduced by the three claimants, the term *knowledge* is at bottom really a relative one. A clear understanding upon this point is absolutely necessary if we are to build from the foundation. Especially, too, must the claims of experience—empiricism—which have been unduly exaggerated during the past century, be kept within proper bounds, and the claimant taught to know its limitations and proper place.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

Lima, New York.

ANCIENT MEXICO REVIEWED BY A MODERN TRAVELER.

CONTIGUOUS to our southern line of empire for a thousand miles, there lies a land venerable with age, enchanting of vista, affluent beyond computation in the gifts of Nature, whose geographical boundaries, geological vaults and social activities dwarf to mediocrity many nations of premier rank; a land whose chronology was old ere Phœnician or Corinthian displayed his superiority upon the raging main, before Homer sang or dauntless Hannibal had thrown his ramparts beyond the towering Alps; an embryonic giant among the races that are to come, and as familiar to the American populace as the bazaars of old Kabul or the fjords of fast-flowing Magellan—the ancient and modern land of Mexico.

The Federal Government has been formulated along American lines, and the capital, the City of Mexico, like Washington, is located in the Federal District. There are two legislative chambers, the Deputies and the Senate. The Presidential term covers a period of six years.

It is the writer's earnest desire to present unbiasedly the knowledge acquired during two interesting sojourns along the beaten and unbeaten paths of a Spanish-American republic that covers an area equaling Germany, Japan, France and Spain combined. That the country has many leagues to travel before consummating the Utopian state there can be no denial, for we readily agree there is room for vast improvement socially, politically and industrially. But notwithstanding the malevolent thrusts so frequently leveled at

the ignorance and lethargy of our neighbors, irrefragable evidence is abundant that they have been grossly misrepresented in many ways. Humboldt was astonished at the progress of higher education in the City of Mexico in 1803.

"No city in the New World," he wrote, "not even excepting those of the United States, has scientific establishments as grand and solid as those of the Mexican capital." The metropolis had its Colegio de Minería, its botanic garden, museums, laboratories and collections of all sorts. This educational movement began early. Cortés invested the seat of government on August 23, 1521, and in 1522 it contained schoolhouses to hold a thousand pupils. Eight years later—that is to say, ninety-one years antedating the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock—the brilliant sons of Loyola proclaimed the classics throughout the halls of the Colegio San Juan de Letras. The doors of the University of Mexico were opened in 1553, or eighty-three years prior to the erection of Harvard College. At the end of the sixteenth century seven seats of higher learning had been established. In the elementary branches the Jesuits and Franciscans strove sedulously to disseminate education among the masses of the people. A century before Captain John Smith sailed for the shores of Virginia the first newspaper of the New World was being printed in the ancient Aztec capital.

Mexico is the land of wonders, but none surpasses its climatic conditions. Along the coast belt the sun beats down with tropical intensity, thirty miles inland the mercury descends, up and beyond this point the temperate zone is reached. Foothills of the Sierra Madre Mountains rise abruptly near the plateau upon which rests so much of the Republic. Metropolitan gauges have registered an average of sixty-two degrees during August for twenty years, due, of course, to the altitude, the capital being 7,400 feet above the level of the sea. The transportation system has been mainly constructed and operated by Americans, although English investors were first on the ground and planned the line from Vera Cruz to Mexico City, one of the greatest feats of engineering ever consummated by the railroad builder. In 1873 the total length of track was 335 miles; to-day upwards of 16,000 traverse every State and cut the time of communication to hours where a generation ago weeks were required to cover the same journey. The telegraph system is extensive, 45,000 miles of wire being in operation. There is no country in the world where railroading has demanded more patience, labor and ingenuity than we find displayed on the various mountain lines of Mexico. Double locomotives of the most powerful type are largely used, owing to steepness of the grade. Nor does the scenery along any route surpass the magnificent

views presented to the traveler making his way from Tampico to the interior or from Vera Cruz to Esperanza, at the edge of the tableland. Our own Rockies and the Selkirks of Canada present a thousand vistas of enthralling grandeur to the enchanted beholder; nowhere, however, has nature provided prospects more sublime than those greeting the voyager along the eastern slope of the great Cordilleras.

Pike's Peak, in Colorado, is an eminence of conspicuity, being 14,108 feet above the earth, and the same is true of Mont Blanc, the Alpine king, 15,781 feet amidst the clouds; but neither of these monarchs attains the dignity of the famous "White Lady of Mexico"—Ixtaccihuatl—whose silver diadem graces her queenly brow at an elevation of 17,500 feet.

The Tropic of Cancer, 400 miles south of the Texas border, is crossed at Catorce, the northern parallel of latitude being indicated by a monument near the railroad. The line denoting the tropical zone flashes around this terrestrial globe just north of the Philippines, Canton, China, and Calcutta, India, thence crosses the Red Sea and the barren wastes of Sahara, all of which are justly celebrated for their torrid climate. The traveler, however, feels no discomfort here, for Catorce is fanned by the buoyant winds that waft their way through the illimitable void of heaven 6,200 feet above the level of the earth.

How often we forget all time, when lone
Admiring Nature's universal throne;
Her woods—her wilds—her mountains—the intense
Reply of *hers* to our intelligence!

Tourists going from Vera Cruz to the capital find it convenient and agreeable to break their ride at Orizaba, one of the most picturesque towns under the sun. The sightseer now gets his first glimpse of a real Mexican sombrero, the station swarming with an army of Indians whose headgear in many cases is a trifle larger than the owner. It is not hyperbolical to say that some of these peculiar steeples are fully four feet tall and three feet broad, as the highest aspiration percolating through a peon's mind is to become possessed of a hat more elaborate in design than his neighbor's. A diminutive car, drawn by two ponies, conveys the passenger to his hotel, and from time to time the embryonic horses are urged to greater animation by the mellifluous fanfare blown by the bugler-driver. The place is walled in by a vast range of mountains, the mightiest of them all being cloud-shattering Orizaba, who soars his shimmering crown far and away into the translucent reaches of empyrean space—eighteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. Even the elastic conscience of the perspicacious Münch-

hausen might have felt a slight qualm at branding Orizaba as an ultra-progressive community, for everything bears a patriarchal aspect. The cobblestones upon which the ox carts so leisurely travel appear to have been used to hold the bow of the Santa Maria to windward during her cruise across the tempestuous currents of the Spanish Main. Innumerable houses are devoid of glass, iron bars acting as a substitute; on the other hand, the adobe hut of every peon is illuminated by a twentieth-century electric light. The climate would suit a pessimist—pleasantly warm during the day and cool enough for blankets in the hours of slumber.

Puebla is altogether different from Orizaba, being a manufacturing centre of prominence. The Cathedral, an enormous edifice, second only to the great church in the capital, is 325 feet long and 100 feet wide. There are a full score of bells in the lofty tower, one of which weighs 20,000 pounds. The high altar cost \$110,000 and twenty years were consumed in its erection. That the 100,000 Pueblans are deeply religious is attested by the presence of forty-six large and handsome churches. From the hills of Guadalupe there may be viewed a magnificent chain of mountain giants, among which is easily discerned the ermine dome of colossal Popocatepetl (18,300 feet), the aerial demigod who surveys this puny sphere from the solitudes on high. An hour's ride in an out-of-date mule car brings the sightseer to the Pyramid of Cholula, a platform nearly two hundred feet above the ground. The base is fully 1,500 feet long, or twice the length of the celebrated Cheops of Egypt. A half-hour is required to ascend the winding stairway, and the climber is well repaid for his exertions, for here he finds the Grotto of Our Lady of the Remedies, where countless thousands of the faithful yearly come to ask assistance in their afflictions. It is commonly asserted in the vicinity of Puebla that miraculous cures have been effected through the intercession of Nuestra Señora de los Remedios. Hundreds of crutches are fastened to the wall as further corroboration.

Mexico City, the handsome and substantial capital of the Republic, with a population of 550,000, was founded by the Aztecs in 1325, and probably contained a hundred thousand souls before Columbus saw the light of day. The streets are of good width, well cleaned and lighted. At night the policemen stand with lanterns at the intersections of the various thoroughfares, and it is said that should a person in need of an illuminant carry off the light the officer is fined five dollars, while an unsuccessful pilferer is levied on for an equal tribute. Modern business structures are quite numerous, and several approach the dignity of skyscrapers, although ten stories is the limit prescribed by the local law. The

General Post Office is of imposing appearance, and the National Opera House, now nearing completion, representing an investment of \$5,000,000, will rank with the grandest in the world. It exemplifies the native love of the musical.

The National Museum is worth traveling far to visit, for herein are to be found parchments of great age and interest. The coach of state used by the ill-fated Maximilian is a prominent relic of empire days. But by far the most interesting and instructive object is the famous Aztec Calendar Stone. This peculiar work of the sculptor's art was used by the race of other days to determine the various seasons of the year. It also suggests that mathematics and astronomy were not unknown sciences. The Stone, which is ten feet tall and six feet wide, was formerly lodged in the wall of the Cathedral, to be later removed to its present home. The National Art Gallery has an international reputation for its vast collection of paintings, and the native artists have good reason to be proud of their labors, as their pictures in many cases will stand comparison with those of world-wide prominence. The National Palace, containing various offices of the Government, is a long, low structure. On its façade hangs the "Bell of Dolores," which first rang out its pæans of independence in 1810, when Father Hidalgo marched forth to free his beloved Mexico from the bonds of European sovereignty. The Conservatory of Music has graduated a larger number of pupils during its existence of a century than any similar institution on this continent. Twelve great schools of the Federal District comprise law, medicine, engineering, architecture and commerce, besides a school devoted exclusively to the fine arts. The homes of these societies are generally handsome and substantial structures, equipped with every modern improvement.

Several of the beautiful drives around the city are lined for miles with stately trees and shrubbery. Carriages are numerous, a respectable two-horse vehicle being obtainable at one dollar per hour for three persons. The celebrated Castle of Chapultepec, the White House of Mexico, reposing on a hill in the outskirts, in the earlier centuries was the home of Montezuma and later that of the various Viceroys dispatched by the King of Spain to rule his empire beyond the seas. The great Cathedral, standing on the site of the ancient Aztec Temple, is the grandest edifice of the Western Hemisphere. Begun in 1573, a century was consumed in its construction. It is 425 feet wide, 200 feet deep and cost, including the beautiful furnishings, \$5,000,000 gold; the chancel rail is of solid silver and many of the paintings and statuary are priceless. The organ in this vast basilica is as tall as a three-story house and almost as

large. Here on Sundays and feast days may be seen representatives of every degree of human society. Side by side on the bare stones of this gorgeous tabernacle (for pews are not in general use in Mexico), the grandee of New Granada, the ragged peon, the graceful daughter of old Castile and the humble pancake woman reverently bow the head as the priest uplifts the Prince whose Crucifixion won redemption for the soul of man. Other churches of note are scattered throughout the city, including those of the Baptist, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian and Jewish sects. There is also an English-speaking Catholic church, and the Knights of Columbus possess a flourishing council. Two daily newspapers furnish current news for twenty thousand American and British residents.

While the vast bulk of the populace adhere to the ancient faith, judicious vigilance has not altogether prevailed in the selection of public officials, with the result that emissaries of the Grand Orient have for many years controlled the reins of government. The despotic Juarez was strongly identified with the Masonic fraternity, and the same was true of Diaz, the lately deposed Dictator. These two men enforced most drastic laws against religion, suppressing or holding in servitude the various congregations and confiscating schools, convents and colleges and in various ways harassing and retarding the work of the Church. President Diaz, although an autocrat, was somewhat lenient with the religious orders, owing in large measure to the influence of his wife, a lady of deep piety. This "generosity" has allowed the opening up of educational and charitable institutions in all the eight archiepiscopal provinces of the country. Of course, it is tacitly understood that their existence is solely due to the sufferance of the authorities. Nuns are not permitted to appear in public wearing the habit of their community, nor are processions tolerated beyond the walls of the parish church. Hence, when we consider the treatment accorded the religious by the autocratic Government, they have performed valiant service for Church and State. Handsome cathedrals are found in every section, and judging by the throngs assisting at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the imprescriptible cause of Rome is the imprescriptible cause of the Mexican people.

The railway route leading to historic Cuernavaca (5,000 feet) is one gigantic zigzag, and the throbbing locomotives must serpentine up and around the precipitous crags that lead to La Cima, *two miles* above the undulating breakers of the Oriental seas. American "specials" have been known to annihilate seventy-five miles of space in the course of an hour's run, but here two powerful engines, belching like maddened demons, require about

five hours to cover the same distance between the termini of the division. At times the groaning train crawls along like a tortoise as it skirts the sides of the imperious giants that reign in august serenity far beyond the hills and vales, cañons and hamlets in the dizzy depths below. The descent is made at lively speed in the shadow of Ajusco (13,000 feet), which forms the culminating point of the mountain ridge. On and on through fields of sugar cane and rolling hills we twist and curve until to the south of us a myriad of domes and steeples proclaim the vicinity of an ideal spot wherein to while away the vacation hours at our disposal—Cuernavaca—summer home of the élite and favorite rendezvous of Cortés and Maximilian. Elegant mansions abound on every side; also handsome boulevards and drives, and it is quite an agreeable sight to view the grand señora and petite señorita taking their afternoon spin behind a pair of prancing bays that step along with all the hauteur befitting high-born members of the equine family.

Aguas Calientes (hot waters), a manufacturing town of 40,000 inhabitants, is noted for the beauty and variety of its "drawn work." This embroidery is all wrought by the skillful hands of Indian peasants. It is safe to say the famous needlewomen of Paris cannot surpass the artistic productions of these humble peons of Mexico.

Almost everything known to man is grown in different sections of the country, including cotton, oranges, rice, wheat and hemp. Industrially the nation has made great strides within recent years, factories and foundries being numerous in the various States. The steel plant at Monterey represents an investment of \$6,000,000. Several cattle ranches cover upwards of 25,000 acres. The production of sugar increases steadily, the crop totaling 160,000 tons last year. Coffee culture resulted in the growth of 66,000,000 pounds during the same period. There is scarcely a mineral known to the geologist that does not find lodgment beneath the surface of this favored land. For 350 years mining has been adding millions upon millions to the national wealth. Fabulous fortunes have been dug from the centre of the earth, and will so continue for generations to come, as Mexico is honeycombed with gold, silver, copper, coal and other deposits. In round numbers, the production of the precious metals during the past decade amounted to the stupendous sum of \$530,000,000 (gold). The production of all other ores probably reached not less than \$300,000,000. The writer has not been able to ascertain the monetary value of the oil wells, but it soars to fabulous figures, one well alone producing not less than 65,000 barrels daily. The State of Vera Cruz, it is prophesied, will in years to come produce oil in greater quantities than any fields on the globe.

Vera Cruz, chief port of the Republic, is no longer the home of yellow fever. The town has been thoroughly sewered, paved and cleaned and all buildings are painted white. The Government has recently spent millions upon a fine system of wharves and a large breakwater to give shelter to the ships that arrive from foreign ports. Tampico is also reaching out for transmarine trade, and great improvements there will give impetus to commercial expansion in the interior of the Northeastern States. Salina Cruz, Manzanillo, Mazatlan and Guaymas are the principal ports on the Pacific coast, and all are now connected by rail with the interior. Various steamship lines have regular sailings from these points up and down the coast of the continent. With characteristic enterprise, the Japanese have two into Manzanillo and Salina Cruz. Guadalajara, Monterey, San Luis Potosi, Torreon and Chihuahua are thriving cities. Foreign commerce last year was well over \$225,000,000, sixty per cent. being with the United States. Former Consul General Barlow estimated that Americans have placed five hundred million dollars in various Mexican industries.

Much credit should be given to the late Edward H. Harriman, the famous railroad king, for his work on the western slope of the Cordilleras. Shortly before traveling to the unknown bourne he had prepared and put into operation an extension of the Southern Pacific Railroad from Guaymas down along the coast to Guadalajara, opening up the ports of Mazatlan and Altata and developing a vast stretch of territory whose subterranean vaults will yield untold wealth and greatly aid in the material development of a section that has lain unproductive throughout the ages for lack of proper transportation facilities. The able railroad builder's fertile mind readily saw the tremendous possibilities resulting to the pristine States of Sinaloa and Tepic, and it assuredly required undaunted courage on the part of the man who put millions into a project that traverses eleven hundred miles of sparsely inhabited country, for Sonora, Sinaloa and Tepic, although covering 120,000 square miles, contain less than 800,000 souls. The Kansas City, Mexico and Orient Railroad will reach from Kansas City to Topolobampo, on the Gulf of California, passing through Oklahoma and Texas. The line, together with its branches, will probably exceed 1,500 miles in length.

The last census was taken in 1910, and special efforts were put forth to make it as accurate as possible. The Bishops issued pastoral letters exhorting the faithful to facilitate the task, the result showing upwards of fifteen millions within the borders of the country. The *Statesman's Year Book* gives the whites as comprising twenty per cent., the mixed race as forty-two per cent. and Indians

thirty-eight per cent. Americans, who are second in the list of people of foreign birth, nearly monopolize the railway system and a large share of the mining industry; the grocery business is almost entirely in the hands of the Spaniards; the Germans control the hardware market; the French excel in textiles. British trade is mostly wholesale, and they are well represented in financial circles.

While this article has not for its purpose the arraignment of the laws of Mexico, thinking men must recognize the inadvisability of allowing a chosen few to own vast stretches of farming lands. Enormous haciendas should be dissolved by national legislation and divided into ranches of twenty-five or fifty acres. This would result in keeping down much of the rebellious spirit periodically displayed by the peasantry, and it should also bring in a desirable immigration from overcrowded Europe. Latitude gives only a rude indication of climate. A factor of much importance is altitude. Tourists find blankets a comfortable adjunct in mile-high San José, Costa Rica, a few degrees above the equatorial line.

The scheme of a railway uniting North, Central and South America originated in the mind of Hinton Rowan Helper, a famous political writer in his day, who was American Consul at Buenos Ayres in the years 1861-66. He wrote eloquently of the Pan-American, or "Three Americas" Railway, which would some day extend from Bering Sea to the Strait of Magellan. The idea fascinated the mind of James G. Blaine, who openly championed it and did much to bring it into notice. When the rails of Mexico's railway system reached from Salina Cruz to the northern border of Guatemala, at Mariscal, July 1, 1908, the Pan-American enthusiasts saw it as a great link in the gigantic railway dreamed of by Helper long years before a north and south trunk line road was projected for that country. Mexico has done her share of the work of building the "Three Americas" line. Guatemala, by means of the Central Railroad, is doing hers, and before the close of 1912 one may travel by rail to Guatemala City from British Columbia, Canada, and all parts of the United States. The construction of less than one hundred miles southward from Santa Maria will join with the railway system of Salvador and connect the capital of that Republic with the United States by rail.

There are short lines in Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, which will eventually join terminals. Already a railroad extending through a large section of Panama, from David to Panama City, has been surveyed and construction begun. In Colombia there has not been much new construction that would be part of the Pan-American system, but new lines are being contemplated and financed.

In Ecuador railroad connections already exist between Guayaquil, a port on the Pacific, and Quito the capital. A good part of this line would be the trunk system of the Pan-American Railway. In Peru the road from Cuzco south to Lake Titicaca and the road in Bolivia from Lake Titicaca south to the capital, La Paz, and then running south into Chile, would form important links in the Pan-American system. A new longitudinal line is already under construction in Chile, and a road which reaches from the heart of Bolivia, south through Argentina to Buenos Ayres, lacks only 175 miles of completion.

The construction of less than 500 miles of track will bring the South American section of the Pan-American Railway as far northward as Lima, connecting the capitals of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru by bonds of steel.

We have alluded to Mexico as a land of antiquity, and it would be well to have a short résumé of its history prior to the arrival of Cortés at Vera Cruz on April 21, 1519. Historians assert that the Toltecs were descendants of an Asiatic tribe that came to the New World across the Pacific or via Bering Strait. In the eighth century they invaded the Mexican Valley and established the capital of Tula. Their superior mentality is shown by the ruins of buildings still extant. As with other races in other lands, the Toltecs four centuries later made way for a newer clan, the Chichimecs, who were far below mediocrity in comparison with their predecessors. Their reign was brief. Then came the Aztecs at the end of the twelfth century and erected their capital upon the site of the present metropolis, naming it in honor of Mexitli, their god of war. They were an energetic and intelligent people, as is illustrated by numerous temples remaining in the neighborhood of the Valley, and evidenced their prowess as warriors by subjugating various tribes of aborigines inhabiting adjacent territory. When Cortés cast anchor their rule extended from Atlantic to Pacific. Self-abnegation was not the errand of the Spaniards, for the armada had been fitted out by Charles V. at the expenditure of many ducats, and of course the tonnage of the tiny frigates was not calculated to reduce to a minimum those distressing symptoms the French call *mal de mer*; indeed, it has been chronicled that the commodore captain of the fleet was far from sanguinary as to his ability to keep afloat until terra firma loomed to view. Moreover, the Castilians, then the premier merchants of the world, thought the natives should offer something more substantial than kind words for the privilege of being enlightened by the most polished members of civilized society. Again, Cortés and his army of six hundred explorers spent many weary days and nights marching

up and around the zigzag trail that led to the habitat of Montezuma, the King of the Aztec nation. All these things were weighty in influencing the foreigners to make demands for at least a province over which should float the banner of the King who ruled in old Madrid. Montezuma was not conciliatory, and the conflict began in earnest, resulting in the permanent predominance of the language and laws of Spain. It should be remembered, however, that the invaders were equipped with modern weapons of war, while the Aztecs used the cruder implements of less "civilized" strategists; it will also be recalled the stubborn resistance offered to the Spaniards, especially at the siege of the capital, proved the natives to be foes of undaunted courage and tenacity.

The period through which we have just passed was by no means fraught with the many dangers to the young as now confront our present great "intellectual" and industrial attainments. So we take pleasure in reproducing an Aztec mother's advice to her daughter, translated from Sahagun's *History of New Spain*. It is as follows:

"My beloved daughter, you have already heard and attended to the words which your father has told you. They are precious words, and such as are rarely spoken or listened to, and which have proceeded from the bowels and heart, in which they were treasured up; and your beloved father well knows that you are his daughter, and God knows that it is so. What more can you hear than what you have heard from your lord and father? Nevertheless, I will say to you some few words. Remember that nine months I bore you in my womb, that you were born and brought up in my arms. This I tell you in order that you may know that I and your father are the source of your being; it is we who now instruct you. Take care that your garments are such as are decent and proper, and observe that you do not adorn yourself with much finery, since this is a mark of vanity and of folly. As little becoming is it that your dress shall be very mean, dirty or ragged. Let your clothes be becoming and neat, that you may neither appear fantastic nor mean. Do not raise your voice very high, nor speak very low, but in a moderate tone. And when you may be obliged to jump over a pool of water, do it with decency, that you may appear neither clumsy nor light.

"Walk through the street quietly and with propriety. See likewise, my daughter, that you never paint your face or stain it or your lips with colors, in order to appear well, since this is a mark of vile and unchaste women. But, that your husband may not dislike you, adorn yourself, wash yourself and cleanse your clothes, and let this be done with moderation. Those noble and venerable

dames, your grandmothers, told us not so many things as I have told you—they said but few words, and spoke thus: 'Listen, my daughters; in this world it is necessary to live with much prudence and circumspection. Hear this allegory, which I shall now tell you and preserve it, and take from it a warning and example for living aright. Here in this world we travel by a very narrow, steep and dangerous road, which is as a lofty mountain ridge, on whose top passes a narrow path; on either side is a great gulf without bottom, and if you deviate from the path you will fall into it. There is need, therefore, of much discretion in pursuing the road.' Only one thing remains to be said, and I have done. If God shall give you life, see that you guard yourself carefully, that no stain comes upon you. When it shall please God that you receive a husband, and you are placed under his authority, be free from arrogance, see that you are not disrespectful to him. Beware that in no time or place you commit the treason against him called adultery. And remember, my daughter, that though no man shall see you, nor your husband ever know what happens, *God, who is in every place, sees you*, will be angry with you and will also excite the indignation of the people against you, and will be avenged upon you as He shall see fit. My dear daughter, see that you live in the world in peace, tranquillity and contentment all the days that you shall live."

Is it to be wondered at that a race so filled with Christian philosophy have survived the onward march of civilization?

Jalapa, the habitat of the mountaineer, is said to contain twenty-five thousand souls, but it is safe to wager that a stranger would undoubtedly be impelled to view the census enumerator with a degree of suspicion, especially if compensated for his labors at so much per capita. The clock that denotes the time of day from the tower of stately El Calvario Church has maintained faithful watch over this picturesque habitation for nearly three hundred years, and is reputed to be the oldest product of the horologist in the Americas. It is quite evident the Moors spent some years in this neighborhood, for everything is quite Moorish, not excepting the tile-covered roofs projecting far beyond the walls of the houses, to frequently shed their burden of rain upon the unfortunate wayfarer in the middle of the circumscribed lanes called *avenidas*. The natives are of a most amiable temperament, even taking a circuitous route to allow the inanimate canines to enjoy their siesta in the shade of the trees that overhang from either side in umbrella-like fashion. Flowers are here, there and everywhere. The balconies attached to the grotesque little homes bring to mind the romantic epoch when heartsick don stood in the pale glow of

Luna twanging those plaintive notes that thrill the ecstatic heart of señorita and sharpen the wits of ever-astute duenna.

One is almost inclined to think that Edgar Allan Poe here received inspiration to pen that sublime verse he named *The Bells*, for Jalapa contains many churches, and from their lofty belfries every half-hour of the day and night the tintinnabulation floats across the town in most discordant rhythm. When the nocturnal shades had mantled all in darkness there could be heard—

The people—ah, the people—
They that dwell up in the steeple,
 All alone,
And who tolling, tolling, tolling,
 In that muffled monotone,
Feel a glory in so rolling
 On the human heart a stone;
They are neither man nor woman—
They are neither brute nor human—
 They are ghouls;
And their king it is who tolls;
And he rolls, rolls, rolls,
 Rolls,
A paean from the bells!

From 1522 begins the era of modern Mexico, so we shall proceed to view a province of the earth by no means modern—a province where civilization prevailed ere Tubal Cain had spanned the Hellespont. Being far to the south of the capital, two days are required to reach the goal. The traveler leaves the train at Oaxaca and devotes several hours to this venerable community. Oaxaca is celebrated for two reasons—it was established six years before the intrepid Genoese pointed the prows of his little caravels to breast the waters of the Western seas and it is the birthplace of two well-known Dictators, Juarez and Diaz, both of Indian blood. As early as 1535 His Holiness Pope Paul III. had established the Bishopric. The climatic conditions are most agreeable—neither hot nor cold—and although it is said to contain 35,000 inhabitants, there is no superior on the map for the subjugation of abnormal nerve tension. Dark-skinned, steeple-hatted gentry amble along the yard-wide sidewalks as placidly as employees of a Socialistic navy yard. An obsolete mule car jogs through the main thoroughfare at a most apathetic pace; in fact, everything is apathetic in this centre of antiquity. Strenuous Americans who are suffering from the excruciating pangs of dollaritis will find nothing to perturb their equanimity along the highways and byways of old Oaxaca.

A pleasant drive of twenty-five miles and the antiquary has bridged the abyss that reaches to the far-distant past—ere Romulus laid the foundations of Eternal Rome or Sabaen reached the zenith of his fame—to the scene of empire now shrouded by the veil

that obscures and darkens the history of a race whose handicraft gives pronouncement to genius and energy of no mean order—the Empire of Mitla!

The most imposing monument is a long, massive building thought to have been the principal hall of legislation. The front is perhaps 250 feet wide, but its height is not above that of a two-story house. The façade is highly ornamented with figure and scroll work, that has successfully weathered the floods and storms of many centuries. The Hall of Mosaics calls forth the plaudits of the most cynical skeptic, for here are found countless thousands of exquisitely carved blocks that, unless closely inspected, give the appearance of being hewn from a single stone of titanic size. The walls are about six feet thick, while the hall itself is only twelve feet wide. The Hall of Monoliths is 30 feet in width and 100 feet in length, the walls being of usual size. In the centre stand a half-dozen columns fifteen feet in height and ten feet in circumference. The pillars undoubtedly acted as supports for beams that reached from wall to wall. Another interesting relic appears to have been a sarcophagus or mausoleum for the interment of important men. Its solid masonry is in a fine state of preservation. There are many ruins of platforms and walls scattered throughout this weird world of the eons that translate us to the enchanted age of fable.

We gazed as one stupefied at the prospect our baffled mind failed to unravel. Whence came these people no archæologist attempts to define. Whither they departed is a problem as dark as the fathomless depths of the seven seas. They themselves have perished from the face of the earth, but the solidity of their noble architecture gives irrefutable proof of intellectual superiority even above many civilized nations of our own enlightened age.

Type of the antique Rome! Rich reliquary
Of lofty contemplation left to Time
By buried centuries of pomp and power!
At length—at length—after so many days
Of weary pilgrimage and burning thirst,
(Thirst for the springs of love that in thee lie,)
I kneel, an altered and an humble man,
Amid thy shadows, and so drink within
My very soul thy grandeur, gloom and glory!

It is far from our purpose to appear censorious, but two visits to the Sierra Madré plateau have confirmed the belief that much of the antagonism toward "Americanos" has been engendered by the supercilious attitude of many misguided individuals who have gone to Mexico for one of two reasons—either to make money quickly and make a quick getaway or have made money quickly and made a quick getaway. It *must not* be understood, however,

that this applies to *all* our countrymen now below the Rio Grãnde, but it is a lamentable fact that a considerable percentage of American adventurers in New Spain have given their Mexican acquaintances to understand that a fourth-class Yankee is far superior to a first-class "greaser," the facetious euphemism usually applied to the inoffensive natives. The truth of these words is recognized and regretted by the intelligent American, who loathes his bombastic countryman, for he knows the Mexicans to be a kind, cultured and conservative people, and they (the Americans) quite naturally regret the social ostracism placed against them and their families because of the ignominious conduct of those who have left their country for their country's good. It should be understood that entrée to a Mexican home may not be had merely for the asking. It is possible to be intimately acquainted with a gentleman for years without ever being invited to dine with his family. As an illustration of the conservatism of the élite, Madame Calderón de la Barca, wife of the former Minister of Spain to Mexico, writes: "There is one piece of etiquette entirely Mexican, nor can I imagine whence derived, by which it is ordained, that all new arrivals, whatever their rank, foreign Ministers not excepted, must, in solemn print, give notice to every family of any consideration in the capital that they have arrived and put themselves and their homes at the disposal of the residents, failing in which etiquette the newly arrived family will remain unnoticed and unknown."

Several years ago an American capitalist who made a great fortune in a mining operation built a palatial home on the magnificent Paseo de la Reforma. When the time arrived to throw wide the portals, invitations were issued to every family of importance, especially those of the *most exclusive* ranks of society. The caterer whose cuisinery nourishes the æsthetic palates of the elect outdid himself in the splendid déjeuner prepared for the auspicious event, while contraltos and tenors of great renown were at hand to charm the well-bred ear of dignified señor, elegant señora and lithesome señorita. It so happened, however, that the wife of the man of millions in previous days had contracted a marriage with a gentleman whose idiosyncrasies (so she said) made life unbearable. She thereupon repaired to Reno, and after a curtailed sojourn in the "queen" city of Nevada took as husband the mining king. It is unnecessary to remark that up-to-date institutions of the divorce mill order are quite incompatible with the retrogressive life of "Darkest Mexico," and several priests have been known to use egregious epithets regarding it and its supporters. For the benefit of those who have as yet to scale the pinnacles of the Cordilleras, it

may be stated that although a very hot day is still unrecorded by the painstaking clerk to whom has been assigned the tabulation of the atmospheric data of the City of Mexico, nightfall frequently means light overcoats and furs, even in the season when the great caloric orb casts his most effulgent glare upon the Southland. In order to better understand the meaning of 7,400 feet, let us cast our mind's eye upon a modern ten-story building, a type by no means common in these days of babelized architecture, excepting in a few of the larger cities. We will place ten cloud-piercers upon the first, and continue to add ten upon ten until we have an edifice that might baffle a New York contractor—some seven hundred stories above the ground!—and the air is so light at this point that the mercury descends immediately after sunset, sometimes falling to 40 degrees by 10 o'clock. The night of the soirée a polar blast swept across the northern horizon, and when the hour arrived for exchanging felicitations the magnate's garçons slumbered for want of something to do. Not one Mexican lady of recognized social status graced the gathering. A few weeks later the grand dame's physician peremptorily ordered her to quit the city, because of the enervating effects of the altitudinous oxygen! The mansion was sold for half the pesos required to build it.

Consul General Parsons has this to say regarding the security of the person:

"In the United States the impression is prevalent that life in Mexico is unsafe as compared with life at home. I myself heard that a revolver was a wise precaution at almost any time. The agreeable truth is, that in my experience the average Mexican peasant, man or woman, is gentle and courteous to a surprising degree. Apart from this impression of the gentle nature of the people, one's sense of personal security in Mexico is enhanced by the unusual efficiency of the police system. At night the presence of the gendarme with his lighted lantern at short, regular intervals along the streets of the cities and in the smaller towns, and the half-hourly recurrence of his long, shrill whistle during one's hours of wakefulness would give even the timid a sense of constant protection quite unknown in the United States."

It will be recalled that Mexico comprises 767,323 square miles of territory, and its great length makes it a land of magnificent distances. Thus the traveler leaving the metropolis for Merida, the principal city of the Yucatan peninsula, boards the early train for Vera Cruz, arriving at the coast the same evening. The following morning he embarks for Progreso, which is reached two days later. After viewing the grandeur of Mitla, the antiquary is prepared to view with complacency anything pertaining to this land of

the ancients. But the various ruins on the peninsula of Yucatan call forth the wonderment and admiration of the most blasé globe-trotter who knows every entrepôt on the globe as the skillful mariner knows his compass.

First of all, let us read the tribute of a great American archæologist to the genius, energy and scholarship of this prehistoric race whose heritage to posterity proclaims them a people of the highest order of civilization.

"From this treasure house in Yucatan," he writes, "comes the key to a thousand problems that have vexed scholars and tormented theologians, and a knowledge of astronomy and mathematics that has dictated the chronologies and cosmogonies of Europe. These people had a regular calendar; they had measured the earth; there is a strong presumption that they had the mariner's compass; they were great navigators and merchants; they gave us an alphabet from which our own has come; as builders they surpassed us; they preceded England as the mistress of the seas; they made our land the granary of the world while Egypt was savage and the ancestors of our race had neither clothes, weapons nor habitations."

Our first invasion of the interior was to view the group of Maya ruins of Uxmal, now brought by rail within comfortable traveling distance of Merida. For three hours the tourist speeds across fifty miles of unbroken fields of henequen, with Muna as his destination. A horse is then procured to cover the fifteen miles to Uxmal. There are five great structures or groups of structures here, which are considered excellent specimens of Maya architecture. The Governor's Palace is a massive building, 320 feet, 40 feet wide and 25 feet high. That the building was erected with a view to stand the pressure of centuries is shown in the size of the walls, which are perhaps ten feet thick. There are nine doorways in the front of this long edifice, and the façade is of rare beauty and originality. A peculiarity of the interior is the narrowness of the rooms, which are limited by the span of the arch, and rarely exceed twelve feet across. Some fine sculpture work is seen in and around the Palace, especially of animals and serpents.

The Pyramid Temple of the Magician is a huge pyramidal mound, 240 feet long, 160 feet wide and 80 feet high. A ruined building surmounts the summit, but we failed to reach it because of the steepness of the almost perpendicular stairway.

The Nunnery Quadrangle comprises four rectangular structures, all highly ornamented with heads of wild beasts, birds and serpents. It is thought that these buildings were formerly used as communal dwellings for bodies of sacerdotal orders.

The ruins at Chichen-Itza are among the most important on the peninsula. The Tennis Court consists of two parallel walls, each 275 long, 30 feet high and 120 feet apart. The walls are of plain masonry, and projecting from the centre of each, at the height of 20 feet from the ground, is an immense ring of stone, representing two entwined serpents. Spanish archæologists assert that this was a courtyard devoted to the playing of a favored game, the object being to cast the ball through the ring fixed in the wall. Another great temple, called the Castillo, and built upon an immense pyramidal mound 200 feet high, is approached by a grand stairway of countless steps. At the base are the heads of two colossal serpents in sculptured stone. The Nunnery, resting upon an artificial platform 30 feet high, is about 100 feet long, 20 feet wide and 18 feet in height. Upon this rests a smaller edifice 30 feet long and 12 feet in width.

At Izamal the pyramid is one of the most imposing of all the ruins. It is perhaps 60 feet high and at the base is 300 feet square. There are several other ruins in Izamal, and the stucco work here is said to be the best the Maya artists ever produced. The cement workers were evidently expert at their calling, for many of the designs are still intact after the lapse of ages.

Wandering about that silent tangle of tropical vegetation which covers every stately mass of ruins, or tramping through the gloomy halls where the only sound is one's footfall, or the echo of it, a feeling of awe and mystery steals over the visitor. To this is added wonder and admiration for the people and especially for the architect who raised on high these lofty structures. Students of the place assured us that these massive piles can be none other than evolutions of the genius of some great mind, as their architect worked out the plan for them to the minutest detail. We were further assured there must have been working drawings made of these buildings long before their construction was started, drawings in which the ground plan, elevation and constructive design were fully worked out and the placing of doorways, mouldings and all details of sculpturing fully decided upon.

We returned to Merida greatly edified and enlightened by our tour of the ancient Mayan Empire. It was a revelation transcending our wildest flights of fancy.

WILLIAM S. LONG.

Camden, N. J.

A MARTYR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

THE Revolution of 1789 has become, of late years, the favorite theme of many French writers of note. Students, like M. Gautherot, whose lectures* on the subject attract much attention, have undertaken to sift to its very depths the history of that momentous period. Their researches have unearthed documents, hitherto unpublished, that throw unexpected light upon certain features of a story that, for political purposes, is often deliberately misrepresented.

The strange fascination of the subject is easily understood; the Revolution of 1789 was by no means an isolated event, a mere local occurrence; its issues are closely bound up not only with the modern history of France, but of Europe itself. Many of the evils that are at present undermining the Latin countries of Europe have their root in the tremendous outbreak of 1789; for instance, M. Gautherot has traced out the mysterious and demoralizing action exercised by the Freemasons at the end of the eighteenth century, an action that has gone on increasing since 1789, until it has become, what it is now in France and in Italy, the governing power of the country.

The Revolution of 1789 was deliberately prepared by the philosophers and atheists—Voltaire, Diderot, Jean Jacques Rousseau and others—through whose influence the popular mind was trained to cast aside the principles of civil and ecclesiastical authority it had been accustomed to respect.

Certain abuses, that might have been remedied without violence had the rulers of the day possessed more insight and firmness, helped to develop a movement that, at the outset, professed to be merely political and social. The irreligious character that it speedily assumed was prominently brought before the public by the beatification, six years ago, of the sixteen Carmelites of Compiègne, who were beheaded in July, 1794, merely because they were nuns. It has been further illustrated by the inquiries made into the history of several other groups of religious, whose only crime—as the official documents abundantly prove—was their “fanatisme,” a term that, in Revolutionary parlance, meant their devotion to the Catholic Church. Thus, the Sisters of Charity executed at Cambrai, the thirty-two nuns guillotined at Orange, the Ursulines of Valenciennes, besides hundreds of priests who perished in prison or on the scaffold, were martyrs of the faith in the same conditions as the Carmelites of Compiègne. It is believed that when the necessary formalities

* At the Catholic University of Paris.

have been gone through, these different groups of martyrs will be raised, in their turn, to the altars of the Church.

The fact that the Revolution of 1789 was essentially an anti-religious movement is exemplified, no less forcibly, by the story of a young Breton nun, Victoire de St. Luc, who perished on the scaffold three days after the Carmelites of Compiègne. Her fate alone would make her story worth telling, but apart from her tragic destiny she is an interesting and sympathetic character. She belonged to the "noblesse de province," about whom little is known outside France, for whereas the sufferings of the royal family and their immediate followers are familiar to students of history throughout the world, the women who lived in the provinces are unknown beyond their own country. Mademoiselle de St. Luc's story throws a pleasant light upon the life of a noble Breton family before 1789. Whatever abuses may have existed in other provinces, where the "châtelains" left their country homes to bask in the sunshine of royalty at Versailles, in Brittany ties of mutual confidence united the lords of the manor to their tenants. To the latter, who suffered from no oppression, the political and social changes that they had not sought brought only oppression and misery.

Victoire de St. Luc was borne at Rennes on January 27, 1761. She belonged to an ancient and honorable family. Her father was, at the time of her birth, a magistrate attached to the Parliament of Brittany. He eventually retired into private life and went to reside near Quimper, at the Château du Bot, a property inherited by his wife.

The latter, Françoise du Bot, was a woman of rare worth. With an insight that was uncommon in her class, she foresaw from the first the far-reaching effects of what many considered a passing disturbance. Her strong spiritual instinct habitually influenced her judgment, and in the final tragedy of her life it glorified her views of suffering and death. She had five children, two sons and three daughters, of which Victoire was the eldest.

The little girl was educated partly by the Visitation Nuns of Rennes and partly at home, under her mother's watchful care. She was impetuous and somewhat wilful, one of those generous, lovable but difficult children whose youthful faults are a subject of passing irritation rather than of any real anxiety to their elders. In spite of her restlessness and love of amusement, she often when a child expressed her intention of becoming a nun; as she grew older her religious aspirations developed and gradually they moulded her whole character.

Life in the old Breton manor was almost monastic in its regularity. The massive, irregular granite building was situated in the

most characteristic and picturesque district of Brittany, where even now the inhabitants cling to their old world habits and costume. Before 1789 Mass was said daily in the chapel of the manor and morning and evening prayers were recited in common by the family, their servants and dependents. Madame de St. Luc and her daughters assisted the parish priest by teaching the village children, and they took care of the sick and wounded in a small pharmacy established for the purpose under their roof. Victoire, as the eldest, was her mother's right hand; she threw herself into her charitable work with characteristic enthusiasm. "The most horrible sores were those that she loved best," writes her younger sister, whose valuable reminiscences are of great use to Victoire's biographers, and, to show her respect for the poor, she often served them on her knees. The aspirations of her childhood towards a religious life developed with time, and with the same energy that she carried into her duties as a sick nurse she now prepared for her future life as a nun. She dressed as poorly as possible in order to repress any natural feeling of vanity, and with "wonderful dexterity," says her sister, she made for herself a hair shirt and disciplines that she used with unsparing severity. Hers was a nature to whom it was impossible to do things by halves, and her spirituality, at this period of her life, had all the crudeness and exaggeration of inexperienced youth. Indeed, Victoire's piety seems to have sometimes wearied rather than edified her brothers and sisters, to whom she preached "in and out of season." They used to call her "the little St. Jerome," and laughingly complained that she never "allowed them to enjoy any pleasure."

This unpleasant phase did not last. In the bright-tempered, sympathetic young religious who in after years faced the horrors of imprisonment and death with a smiling heroism that is inexpressibly attractive, it is difficult to recognize the sermonizing little girl of the Château du Bot. Indeed, Victoire's sense of humor is one of her greatest charms; no suffering and no terror could quench her playfulness and, like St. Thomas More, she was to the last intensely spiritual and quaintly humorous.

Fearing that she might injure her health, her mother endeavored to moderate her daughter's love of penance, and, with much good sense, pointed out to her that obedience might be, in her case, the most meritorious form of mortification. When she discovered that Victoire gave all her pocket money to the poor, Madame de St. Luc made over her allowance to one of her sisters, whose duty it was to act as her superioress, to regulate her almsgiving and provide for her personal requirements. Although she had decided to become a nun, the girl still hesitated between an active or a

contemplative order. She had at first meant to join the Visitation Nuns, among whom she spent some years of her childhood. Then her love of penance made her think of the Poor Clares, while her devotion to the poor drew her towards the different nursing orders that made the care of the destitute and of the sick their first object. "She would have liked," says her sister, "to have embraced all these different vocations;" each one in its own way appealed to her.

A visit to Quimper when she was only fifteen brought our heroine the light she sought and definitely shaped her future career. The object of her visit was to attend a mission that was preached in honor of the jubilee of 1776; but after her family had returned to the Bot she remained on in order to take painting lessons from a professor of some repute.

The Bishop of Quimper of that day was her father's brother, and, probably with a view to helping her to make a choice, he introduced her to a group of ladies called "*les Dames de la Retraite*," whose institute was then a hundred years old.

Its foundress was a pious woman, called Claude, Thérèse de Kermeno, who lived at Quimper in the second half of the seventeenth century. She had in her youth wished to join the Visitation Order, but her weak health having prevented her from doing so, she was led to establish a home where women of the world of all ranks might attend spiritual retreats. An institution of the kind had been established at Vannes some years before by a *Mademoiselle de Francheville*, and it suggested the idea of a similar foundation at Quimper. The Jesuits were the promoters of the scheme and generally preached the retreats. In 1678 *Mademoiselle de Kermeno*, having studied the methods of the "*Maison de la Retraite*" at Vannes, hired a large house and, with the consent of the Bishop, *Mgr. de Coëtlogon*, she proceeded to organize spiritual retreats for women, which from the outset were largely attended.

At her death in 1693 one of her companions, *Mademoiselle de Lestrèdegiat*, continued the work with a group of women who, at that time, did not form a religious order in the strict sense of the word. All the members of the association were, as a matter of course, of noble birth; they made no vows and were free to use their own fortune as they pleased; they were even allowed, with the Bishop's permission, to return to their families on a visit. They wore a black dress and a white linen "*coiffe*," and their duties consisted in helping the "*retraitantes*" to make good use of the opportunities afforded to them. When we hear that fifteen or eighteen retreats were preached every year, that some of them were attended by three hundred women at a time and also that many of these were peasants, we shall easily realize that the "*Dames*

de la Retraite" were fully occupied. The Jesuits preached the sermons, and under their guidance the "directrices," as they were called, led the prayers and the singing, explained not only the sermons, if necessary, but also the holy pictures that were a leading feature in all the retreats given by Breton Jesuits. Many of their visitors being illiterate, they had even to refresh their religious instruction, and they taught those who were more advanced how to meditate according to the methods of St. Ignatius. When Mgr. de St. Luc introduced his niece to the "Dames de la Retraite" they were living in a large house, built by Mademoiselle de Lestrèdegiat, which was completed in 1713. It is now used as the "Gendarmerie" of Quimper.

Although they were not bound by vows, they seem to have practiced obedience and self-sacrifice in a very perfect manner, and Victoire was favorably impressed by the zeal with which they devoted themselves to the spiritual welfare of the souls committed to their care during the retreats. To many of the latter these days of recollection marked a new departure in their spiritual life, and the annals of the order tell us of the attention with which women of all rank, noble ladies and uncultured peasants, attended the instructions. These were arranged to suit the necessities of the different classes to which they were addressed. Thus, during the retreats organized for the country women, the sermons were preached in the "bas Breton" dialect.

Mgr. de St. Luc approved his nieces growing sympathy for the "Dames de la Retraite," and when, after much thought and many prayers, she announced her intention of joining their institute, he warmly encouraged her. But Victoire was only fifteen, and though her mother was inclined to let her follow her vocation without further delay, her father demurred, and finally decided that she must wait till she reached her twenty-first year.

Much has been said and written about the religious vocations that were forced upon the young girls of the French nobility under the old "régime." It is certain that in some cases the daughters of noble and impoverished houses were, from their cradle upwards, destined to take the veil in some wealthy abbey, under royal patronage, without their wishes in the matter having been consulted. But conditions of life were different among the unworldly "noblesse" of Brittany and Anjou, and in Victoire's case the only pressure put upon her was intended to try the depth and solidity of her vocation.

The six years that she spent at home after making up her mind to join the "Retraite" amply proved that her desire to become a nun was no girlish fancy. She employed them in preparing for

her future duties. Thus, she thoroughly mastered the "Breton" dialect, with which she was only superficially acquainted, and from her brother's tutor she was only superficially acquainted, and from special study of the best ascetic authors, in order to fit herself to be a safe counsellor to the souls who might be entrusted to her guidance. Her favorite pastime was her painting. She loved, says her sister, "to paint devout pictures," and excelled in "pastels" as well as in oils.

Time and a course of stern self-discipline, rightly applied, had mellowed the crudeness of Victoire's earlier seeking after perfection. Her efforts were now less apparent, her piety less aggressive and the influence of her bright and kindly spirit made her family, her friends and her dependents feel better and happier for her presence. The 2d of February, 1782, was the day fixed for her departure from home. At an early hour she started for Quimper with her mother and her three sisters. In order to spare her father, it was settled that they should leave while he was still asleep. The superioress of the "Dames de la Retraite" was then Madame de Clesmeur, to whom Madame de St. Luc made over her eldest born: "I give into your hands," she said, "my most precious treasure." In the chapel, bright with lights and flowers, the Bishop of Quimper was waiting for his niece. He celebrated Mass, at which his sister-in-law and her daughters received Holy Communion, and as, according to the custom of the institute, Victoire during her last year at home was looked upon in the light of a "postulant," she immediately put on the black dress and white "coiffe" characteristic of the dames de la retraite.

Her portrait, painted by herself, represents her wearing this not ungraceful headgear. The spotless white "coiffe" frames a pleasant and sweet rather than a strictly pretty face, with a delightfully humorous expression about the eyes and lips.

From the outset our heroine seems to have been a valuable and active member of the little community. Her study of the Breton dialect now served her to good purpose, and she was in great demand among the peasant "retraitantes." She had the gift of making them realize the eternal truths which had influenced her own life from her birth upwards. Her own private notes and the short biography written by her sister, Madame de Silguy, tell us something of her inner life. With the exception of a brief period of temptation, doubt and darkness, such as comes to many souls after a great decision has been made, she seems to have been thoroughly content in her vocation. She was never happier than when, as often happened, three hundred "retraitantes" filled the house and claimed her time and attention. "She looked upon

them as her sisters," we are told, and those whom she loved best were "the greatest sinners," over whom she speedily assumed extraordinary influence. She possessed a rare quality of sympathy and the power of winning confidence; moreover, young as she was, she was no novice in spiritual matters, and her own experience helped her to train others to a more perfect life.

In the intervals of the retreats, which were their chief occupation, the "*Dames de la Retraite*" visited the poor and sick in their homes, and Victoire gladly resumed the works of mercy that she had practiced at Le Bot, but her open-handed generosity obliged her superioress to act towards her as her mother had done and to regulate her almsgiving, lest she should deprive herself beyond reason. Her tendency to practice corporal penances so severely as to injure her health had also to be moderated, and in this respect she owed much to the wise control of Madame de Marigo, who in 1783 succeeded Madame de Clesmeur as superioress. It was Madame de Marigo's destiny to witness the ruin of her work and the dispersion of her subjects; she seems to have been a woman of great strength of mind, and, judging from the affectionate tone of Victoire's letters to her, of a sympathetic nature. She possessed our heroine's entire confidence and did much to brace her for the trials ahead.

Before the meeting of the "*Etats Généraux*" in 1789 the approach of the Revolution was felt even in the remote provinces, and the storm that was to overthrow the old régime was slowly but surely gathering strength.

The teaching of the so-called philosophers had prepared the upheaval from a distance; the weakness of the King and the illusions or incapacity of his counsellors allowed the evil forces that were at work a free hand, and as a rule those who were to suffer most cruelly from the effects of the Revolution were the last to realize its gravity.

Here and there, however, we gather a note of alarm, less from the courtiers or great ladies at Versailles than from men and women who, living away from the heated atmosphere of the court, seemed better able to see matters in a true light. Thus, Mgr. de St. Luc, the Bishop of Quimper, was alarmed rather than dazzled by the high-sounding doctrines that were blazed abroad, doctrines that advocated the advent of a golden age of universal brotherhood. Instead of these impossible conditions, he felt that terrible catastrophies were at hand, and he freely communicated his fears to the "*Dames de la Retraite*," with whom he was on terms of confidence. "The most fearful misfortunes will soon fall on our coun-

try," he used to say. "Put all your trust in God, and remember that He never forsakes those who have confidence in Him."

In September, 1790, the Bishop, who at that time was in failing health, visited the community for the last time and encouraged his hearers to meet the future with courage; but in spite of his gloomy forebodings he could hardly have foreseen that the member of his audience who touched him most closely was to be sent to the scaffold by the Revolution whose approach he deplored.

A few days later he heard that the King, Louis XVI., had weakly consented to sign the "Constitution civile du clergé," by which the French priests were to renounce their allegiance to the Holy See.

With a few exceptions, the Bishops and priests of France came out of the ordeal nobly. The greater number declined to take the schismatical oath; and imprisonment, exile, poverty and death were the price they paid for their loyalty to Rome. Mgr. de St. Luc, on hearing of the King's act, turned to his secretary: "Mon ami," he said, "this is our sentence of death," and immediately, in spite of his increasing weakness, he began to write a protest against the oath. Madame de Marigo came to see him the same day: "My daughter," he said, alluding to his letter, "you will be pleased with your Bishop." He died before completing his protestation, which was only made public after his funeral on October 5, 1790.

Nearly all his priests followed his lead, but unfortunately one of the noted ecclesiastics of Quimper, Claude Le Coz, who eventually became schismatic Bishop of Finistère, openly defended the oath, and his attitude roused the indignation of Victoire de St. Luc. In happier days she had heard him preach to the "retraitantes," and she now used this circumstance to appeal to his conscience and good feeling and to implore him to retract his unfortunate adhesion to schism, but her vehement letter met with no response.

About the same time her eldest sister, Madame de Silguy, and her children became ill with small-pox. Victoire undertook to nurse them. She caught the disease, and was for some days in danger of death. But in the end this unforeseen trial, that condemned her to a period of enforced repose and retirement, helped to prepare her for the sterner ordeal that was to follow.

A holy priest, the Abbé de Larchantel, whose sister was a member of the community, visited our heroine during her convalescence and brought her Holy Communion. He deems, moreover, to have exercised a beneficial influence over a nature whose very generosity was a snare. He persuaded Victoire, for example, that to accept the attentions of her companions with gratitude was more perfect than to reject them from a spirit of penance that might wound or humiliate others. Under his wise direction the asperities that still

existed in her character completely disappeared, her piety became more lovable, her spirituality deeper and wider, more capable of influencing others, and during the four years that followed, among circumstances of unusual difficulty, she displayed a heroism, tempered by cheerfulness, that won many souls to a better life.

Meanwhile Mgr. de St. Luc's place was filled by a schismatic priest named Expilly, who on March 12, 1791, took possession of the Cathedral of Quimper. One of his first visits was to the "Dames de la Retraite," whose loyalty to Rome was well known. On this occasion he presumed to offer the superioress to preach retreats in her chapel. "Monsieur, I shall not require your services," was Madame de Marigo's cold reply. The Revolutionary Bishop did not return, but on June 1 he sent a message to the superioress forbidding her to allow any retreats to be given in her house without his permission. Three day later the "Dames" were denounced to the authorities for their "anti-constitutional" principles, and Madame de Marigo was accused of having said that she did not recognize the schismatic as her spiritual chief.

Her attitude in the matter was in strict accordance with the commands of the Holy See. By Briefs issued on March 10 and on April 13, 1791, Pope Pius VI. declared that the constitution civile du "clerge," being founded on "heretical principles," the French priests were forbidden to adhere to it. The consequence of the Briefs was that the faithful could lawfully recognize and obey *only* the ecclesiastics who had refused to take the oath, and that they were forbidden, under pain of sin, to receive the sacraments or even to hear the Mass of the "prêtres jureurs," as the apostates were called.

On July 2 the "Dames de la Retraite" were officially summoned to take the oath of allegiance to the Government by the "Procureur syndic" of the "Department du Finistère." Madame de Marigo and her companions, Mesdames Le Borgne, de Larchantel and de Rospiec, energetically refused to obey, adding that Madame de St. Luc, who formed part of the community, was just recovering from a dangerous illness and could not leave her room, but that she professed their opinions on the subject.

At these words one of the officials observed that he would not leave the house unless Madame de St. Luc expressed her views in person. "Who knows," he said, "if she is not willing to take the oath that you reject?" "No, indeed, monsieur," exclaimed Madame de Marigo, "she will refuse to take it; her opinion is the same as ours." However, as the officials insisted upon a personal interview, they were shown into Victoire's room. She was still weak from her severe illness, but her spirited answer to the summons

had a prophet ring. "Never," said she, "will I take the oath. I will sign my refusal with my blood."

Four days afterwards, on July 6, a faithful priest, the curé of Kerfennteun, said Mass for the last time in the little chapel, where for nearly a hundred years many souls had been cheered, purified and strengthened for the battle of life, and the next day an inventory was made of the "Dames'" furniture previous to their expulsion three days later.

The Government officials were amazed at the steady courage with which these well-born, refined women preferred being sent adrift to what they looked upon as an act of apostasy. "How can you," they urged, "give up all you have in the world? Just take the oaths and you will be left in peace." The "Dames'" chief care was to provide for their servants. They themselves were allowed to carry away only "a knife and fork, one pair of sheets, a small table, a bed and one chair." All the rest of their property was seized and confiscated.

On the 9th of July they were turned out of their house; but "they blessed God," say the annals of the institute, "for having been found worthy to suffer for His holy name, and they prayed for their enemies."

At first the little community was able to remain together under the hospitable roof of the Benedictines of "le Calvaire," who as yet had not been expelled from their monastery. Their abbess, Madame de Penfentenyo, affectionately welcomed the persecuted religious, and Victoire's mother and sisters hastened to Quimper and spent some weeks with the two communities.

Madame de St. Luc, like her brother-in-law, the Bishop, seems to have fully realized the far-reaching consequences of the Revolution; her second daughter, Madame de Silguy, tells us that she continually asked God to give her "a spirit of renunciation and sacrifice and even a spirit of martyrdom," should God call her "to die for her faith."

Victoire, like her mother, was haunted by visions of a violent death; but the prospect, far from disheartening her, acted as a stimulant upon her generous nature. In several prayers written by her at this time is expressed an ardent desire to shed her blood for the Church at the age of thirty-three. She had always professed a special devotion towards the Sacred Heart, a practice which at the beginning of the Revolution was popular among many holy souls, and she spent much time in painting or embroidering scapulars of the Sacred Heart, which she distributed to her friends and acquaintances. One day, during her stay at the Benedictines, a doctor named Alexandre Laroque-Tremaria came to visit a sick

member of the household. He found Victoire busy at her favorite occupation, and upon her offering to give him one of the scapulars he asked for a second one to send to his brother Victor, a naval officer, who was quartered at Lorient. The young religious hastened to satisfy him, adding that his brother must put all his confidence in the Sacred Heart.

This trifling episode, in itself so ordinary and so trivial, marked the unsuspecting worker's first step on the "via dolorosa," of which the Paris guillotine was to be the final station.

In 1792 the Benedictines were in their turn persecuted and dispersed, and the "Dames de la Retraite" again found themselves homeless. Madame de Marigo and Madame de Larchantel joined some of the latter's relations, and Victoire naturally returned to Le Bot. Threatening clouds now hung over the old manor house, once a home of peace, and although the Breton peasantry as a rule were attached to the landlords and to their priests, here as elsewhere men were found who, from conviction or from fear, waged war against the "aristocrates."

Victoire's parents, merely because of their social station, were looked upon by the Government officials with suspicion, and from time to time they were hurried away from their country home and brought to Quimper, that they might, it was said, be under the eye of the "Directoire Départemental," in whose hands were the affairs of the district. Thus, in October, 1792, and again in the spring time of 1793, they were forced to spend several weeks in the town, Victoire naturally accompanied them, and during their second stay she was one day, to her family's intense alarm, summoned to appear before the local authorities. They informed her that she was accused of "fanatism," a term that, during the Revolution, was synonymous with loyalty to the Catholic religion, and that this charge—a serious one in 1793—was based upon the fact that the previous year she had given a scapular of the Sacred Heart to the Doctor Laroque-Tremaria. In the month of March, 1793, the two brothers of that name had been arrested and their papers seized and examined. Among a quantity of letters that showed them to have been unsympathetic to the new order of things was found a letter in which Victor, the naval officer, acknowledged the doctor's gift of a scapular of the Sacred Heart, embroidered by "the charming Victoire." This discovery led to the doctor being questioned on the subject. He plainly stated that the "Heart embroidered on cloth" was a religious emblem that the "Citoyenne St. Luc" had sent his brother "to make him devout"—*pour le rendre dévot*. Victoire in her turn recognized that she had given several of these scapulars to the doctor for himself, for his sisters and his

brother. "Is not this emblem a sign around which rally the enemies of the Revolution?" asked the judge. Victoire replied that she never considered the emblem as having a political meaning. In her eyes it was merely a "sign of devotion and of peace;" for this reason she painted and embroidered many of these scapulars that she gave away.

The doctor's brother, Victor, to whom the scapular had been sent, appeared on March 30 before the authorities at Lorient. He described the scapular as a piece of "violet cloth on which is a Heart, encircled by a crown of thorns, embroidered in cotton; above the Heart is a brown cross;" but, like his brother, he denied that this religious picture had a political significance. The doctor, when brought for a second time before the judge at Quimper, again protested that he considered it as a religious symbol, in which the "Citoyenne St. Luc" had great confidence. "Besides," he added with much good sense, "I could never consider it as an anti-revolutionary sign, inasmuch as I know many aristocrats who do not wear it and many good patriots, women especially, who do wear it."

This seemingly trifling incident does not appear to have alarmed Victoire, who, says her sister, related it "gaily" to her anxious parents. It was indeed difficult to imagine that so trivial an episode as an embroidered scapular sent by a nun to her friends could have tragic consequences in a near future.

For the present the matter seemed dropped, and Madame de Silguy tells us that when their first moment of alarm was past her parents considered that the affair was "at an end." Had they lived in Paris instead of in a remote province they would perhaps have been less sanguine. During the tragic months when the guillotine was permanently erected and in daily use it was the office of the public accuser of the Revolutionary tribunal, Fouquier-Tinville, to provide the executioner with twenty, thirty or forty heads every day. He took care when the name of a possible victim was brought before him never to forget it, and Victoire de St. Luc had been mentioned in connection with the Laroque-Tremaria brothers as the propagator of a "seditious emblem." In order to justify the wholesale massacre of hundreds of people of every rank and age, Fouquier-Tinville was accustomed to bring forward shadowy charges of "conspiring against the safety of the Republic;" and, taking advantage of the general panic, he included under the head of "conspirators" men and women who had sometimes never met or spoken till they found themselves side by side before his tribunal.

By his orders the two Laroques, the doctor and the sailor, were transferred to Paris, and on December 26, 1793, they were charged with being "the promoters of all the conspiracies that have been

organized in the Départements of Finistère and Morbihan since the beginning of the Revolution." As a proof of this sweeping assertion, Fouquier-Tinville exhibited an embroidered Heart, the work of "la nommée St. Luc," which he asserted was a seditious emblem, the sign of the rebels of La Vendee. It is true that the peasants of La Vendee, during the civil war that has made their name famous, sometimes pinned a scapular of the Sacred Heart on their breast, but there is no proof that the two Laroques had any communication with the Vendéans. Both the brothers were merely guilty of disaffection with the new state of things, and unfortunately they omitted to destroy the private letters where their opinions were freely expressed. It mattered little whether the men and women who were brought before the tribunals of the Reign of Terror were innocent or guilty, Fouquier-Tinville's wish was law. "I must have so many heads to-day," he used to say, and the so-called judges, paralyzed by fear, obeyed the commands. The two Laroques were therefore condemned to death, and, according to custom, the sentence was carried out the same afternoon.

During more than six months after she had been questioned at Quimper, Victoire de St. Luc remained unmolested, and her parents' opinion that the charge against her was forgotten seemed justified by circumstances. In August, 1793, the family had returned to Le Bot; but although they heard nothing more of the "seditious emblems" that Victoire was accused of having distributed, they moved in an atmosphere of terror and suspicion, and both Madame de St. Luc and her eldest daughter realized more and more clearly that a catastrophe was at hand.

They did their best to keep up the spirits of those around them, says Madame de Silguy; but, in their own hearts, they prepared for the worst. Madame de St. Luc, who loved her home, endeavored to detach her affections from the old manor house that any day she might be called upon to leave: "She looked upon herself as a stranger in her own home, and, as she often said to her daughters, she could not longer feel that the house was hers." The priests who had refused to take the oath being in prison or in hiding, the inhabitants of the manor were deprived of the sacraments. "They tried to supply the want by more fervent prayers," writes Madame de Silguy, "and God strengthened them through His Grace."

At last, on October 10, 1793, the blow fell. A body of "gendarmes" appeared at Le Bot; they had orders to arrest M. and Madame de St. Luc and their daughters, Victoire and Euphrasie. The two sons had joined the "émigré" army and two married daughters were away. M. de St. Luc, infirm and helpless, was forcibly dragged from his bed and thrown into a cart in presence

of the peasants of the village, who stood by trembling and weeping, while the men of the escort sang revolutionary songs and indulged in jokes at the expense of their victims.

After spending the night at Châteaulin, the prisoners arrived at Carhaix, a small town, where they were taken to a former hospital called "Notre Dame de Grâce." After the Augustinians, to whom it belonged, had been expelled, it served as a barrack; it now became a prison, and when the St. Lucs arrived it was filled with men, women and children, who like themselves had been arrested for the most trivial reasons. Members of the old Breton noblesse were there whose dignified lives had been spent in the retirement of their granite manor houses among the broad "landes" and gorse-covered commons of their native provinces. With them were a number of criminals, robbers and murderers, whose close companionship was one of the worst trials of the unfortunate "aristocrates." Somewhat isolated among the motley crowd were a group of English sailors, prisoners of war, who did not know a word of French.

The building was in a miserable condition, the big rooms bare and dilapidated, the food scanty and wretched, and the invalided prisoners, who were numerous, could expect neither the assistance of a doctor nor that of a priest.

Among these deplorable surroundings Victoire revealed herself. Those who knew her best had often admired her absolute devotion to the spiritual and temporal necessities of others, but they probably hardly realized the fund of heroism that lay beneath the young nun's smiling exterior. This heroism was of a peculiarly charming quality; it was combined with a spontaneous gaiety, a keen sense of humor, a quickness of perception that must have made her invaluable to the dispirited and frightened people who surrounded her at Carhaix.

She immediately gave herself up to cheering, nursing and comforting them, according to their requirements. Her sisters tell us that her gracious kindness conquered prejudice. Thus an atheist was eventually converted through her influence, and many other prisoners whose faith had been disturbed by the evil influences of the day followed his example.

The biographers of Victoire de St. Luc are able, owing to a fortunate circumstance, to follow her closely during the months that she spent in this dismal prison. The "Dames de la Retraite" of Angers have in their possession a journal written by her and her little sister Euphrasie, and called by them a "tragi-comique" narrative of their captivity at Carhaix. It is addressed to their friends who were prisoners like themselves at Cremar, near Quimper,

and to whom the young writers were able, not without some difficulty, to convey the precious manuscript.

Victoire's delightful personality, with its blending of natural charm and supernatural heroism, is fully revealed in this curious document. Her object was to cheer and amuse those who were going through a severe ordeal, and she never sounds a note of complaint or despondency. The style of the narrative bears the impress of the age. It is allegorical, somewhat subtle, complicated and even trivial at times; but the writers' steady determination to make the best of things, their spirited attempt to laugh when they are inclined to cry, their indomitable sense of fun and humorous views of the weakness of human nature are very charming. Underlying these human qualities that explain why Victoire was so universally popular, is an absolute resignation to the will of God and an heroic acceptance of whatever His Providence may ordain.

Nearly all the women, noble or plebeian, who died on the scaffold during the Reign of Terror faced death bravely, but the religious did more and went to the "guillotine" rejoicing. The cheerfulness of the thirty-two nuns who were executed at Orange in July, 1794, almost shocked their tyrants. "These women die laughing," they complained, and the judges of Valenciennes three months later reproached the condemned Ursulines with being "so gay." Victoire de St. Luc was the true sister of these "cheerful givers."

In her diary the inconveniences and miseries of the wretched prison are treated in a humorous tone. The big, bare rooms, where "cobwebs served as tapestry and where armchairs were represented by the bare floor," were filled with prisoners of every age, rank and opinion. The presence of a number of revolutionists added considerably to the sufferings of those who, like the St. Lucs, were only guilty of being Catholics and "aristocrates." The young writers note with some amusement how one of these republicans, once a noted priest-hunter, seemed to have expended all his courage in persecuting others and was now "pale, trembling and dissolved in tears." Another "swears all day in a loud voice." A republican lady, the wife of a leading "patriot," had, to her surprise, been arrested. She hastened to make it known that her great fear was being obliged to frequent "aristocrates;" but, adds the diary, she soon found out that these detestable people whom she dreaded "are the pleasantest and most pitiful;" their kindness made her realize "how much they were capable of forgetting and forgiving past offenses." The bad food is another subject of mirth. The writers imagine that the prison authorities keep them on short rations out of regard for their health, but the consequence of this state of things is that the question of food gradually becomes the

one absorbing topic of conversation: "From the rise of dawn to nightfall nothing is spoken of but provisions. The war-cries that sound unceasingly are: bread, meat, butter, crêpes, milk. Instead of political discussions, we hear nothing but droll and animated arguments upon the provisions that have been or that will be brought."

At the cost of much waiting and weariness the more privileged among the prisoners appear carrying in triumph a loaf of bread or a jug of water. Here and there we meet with touches that betray the religious. "Instead of rules and constitutions drawn up by holy founders, we have rules laid down by the commissaires. . . . All our letters are read by the porter, to whom we must give them with the humility and simplicity of a little novice. We are cloistered with the greatest severity, and we have fewer communications with the outer world than the most strictly enclosed nuns in former times." Another trial was the continual noise, for enclosure in this case did not mean silence. Victoire believes it would be as easy to pray in "the midst of a fair" as in the continual din.

A graver note is struck when she touches on the mutual charity of the prisoners, "of whom each one is ready to deprive himself to help a newcomer and to divide, not indeed his abundance, but the bare necessities of life." The first part of the journal ends with a dissertation half philosophical, half humorous on "the advantages of being in prison." It concludes thus: "All that God allows is for the best and must work for the greater good of His elect."

The second part is no less interesting. It relates the death of an aged prisoner, M. le Bianic de Guisano, who was assiduously watched and cared for by his fellow-sufferers. He was offered the attendance of a schismatic priest, but he replied that unless he could be visited by a priest who had refused to take the oath "he would make his confession to his crucifix" and trust to God's mercy. "God, who has not limited His own power by instituting the sacraments, no doubt took into account his good disposition," add the writers. Another prisoner, a woman, died soon afterwards, and was also deprived of the assistance of the sacraments; but the captive nuns sang the office of the dead near her body and accompanied it to the door of the prison rather than allow the schismatic priest to enter. But there was no silence or solemnity about these prison deathbeds, and in the same room where a dying sufferer was painfully fighting his last battle, other people were either "praying, talking, cooking, writing, singing or dressing." But these miseries never quenched Victoire's sunny spirit. She can afford to smile at the ridiculous sides of a tragic situation and to treat mere material privations with good-humored contempt. The real mainspring of her heroic

cheerfulness is revealed in the closing lines of the journal: "May this long and painful martyrdom open to us the passage of eternal bliss. . . . May all these sorrows detach us from this miserable world and remind us that we are made for a happier destiny that alone will satisfy all our aspirations."

During four months Victoire de St. Luc's presence was the solace and delight of her family and prison friends. Great, therefore, was their dismay when on February 1, 1794, she was summoned to Quimper, in consequence of Fouquier-Tinville having required her removal to Paris, a removal that, in the spring of 1794, when the Terror was at its worst, meant almost certain death.

In a long letter, written after her arrival at Quimper, to her former superioress, Madame de Marigo, she relates with her usual playfulness how she performed the journey. She owns that she felt herself become pale when two gendarmes appeared to take her away, but that she quickly recovered her presence of mind, whereas the distress of her family knew no bounds. She traveled from Carhaix to Quimper on horseback, between her two guardians, under deluges of rain and in the teeth of the wind. We may imagine the difficulties of the two days' journey along rough country roads, "where there was more water than earth." Victoire, whom her life as a nun and her close imprisonment at Carhaix had ill prepared for such hardships, owns that she was drenched by the rain and buffeted by the rough gale that sweeps across the Breton "landes" during the winter months. To add to her difficulties her horse was half-blind, and when she was ordered to mount it only had one stirrup and no bridle, but against this state of things she energetically protested: "It is lucky that I did so, otherwise I should have broken my neck, for my horse fell down under me. I was able, however, to pull him up without dismounting and did not hurt myself."

Holy and happy thoughts filled the mind of the traveled-stained prisoner as she rode under the pitiless rain. She remembered that twelve years before on the same day, February 2, she had made her consecration as a "Dame de la Retraite" in the chapel of her convent. Her uncle had been there to receive her, and her mother, sisters and religious companions, now dispersed by the great storm, had surrounded her with eager, wistful affection. The contrast between that memorable day and her present surroundings only braced up Victoire's courage, and the thought of her religious vocation acted as a stimulant: "God has given me the grace to feel no sorrow for my position. I am gay and calm. I throw myself with confidence into the arms of Providence, with an absolute resignation to God's holy and adorable will." . . . Alluding to

the anniversary that she was celebrating, she adds: "When on that day I consecrated myself to God's service, in His holy house, I devoted myself to accomplish all His designs upon me in life and in death."

She had no illusions as to the probable consequences of a summons to Paris: "If I die, I may say that it is for a holy cause and I ought to look upon death as a kind of baptism that will purify me from my sins. . . . My good mother, do not be depressed by your daughter's fate and join your prayers to hers to offer God the sacrifice that He demands." Some of the prayers written by our heroine in the prison of Quimper have been preserved. They are full of joyous anticipations of the fate that she knew awaited her. "I accept death," she writes, "in the shape and in the manner that may be ordained by God; here or elsewhere, without consolation, without assistance, by the sword, by fire, by hunger or misery, what Thou willest and how Thou willest. Thou art God and my lots are in Thy hands."

To her sister, Madame de Silguy, she had often expressed her desire to suffer martyrdom at the age of thirty-three, and once at Quimper, her sister having suggested that an escape might possibly be combined, she quickly put the idea aside: "I shall never attempt to escape. I should be afraid of compromising my jailer and also of losing the palm of martyrdom."

Her cheerfulness brightened her miserable surroundings. She was put into a room that was already occupied by twelve English sailors, prisoners of war, and by a number of women charged with different offences. The attitude of the first seems to have been blameless. Madame de Silguy enlarges upon their quiet and reserved demeanor. The women were, on the contrary, vicious and violent, and from them Victoire had much to suffer. However, here as at Carhaix, she made the best of things. She managed to procure an old curtain, which she used to part off her bed, and behind this wretched screen she retired to say her prayers. She had brought with her a few books, a New Testament, a book of Psalms and an imitation, and in one of her letters she speaks of the consolation gathered from these precious volumes.

At first the women, who lived in the same room, seem to have persecuted the newcomer, whose noble birth and religious calling excited their hatred. They once beat her so cruelly that she was, we are told, covered with bruises. Then by degrees her sweet kindness had its usual effect. She gave her companions presents of linen from her own poor possessions, and one of the women who ill treated her having become dangerously ill, she nursed her

day and night with unwearied charity, "rendering her the most humiliating services," says her sister, "with unspeakable charity."

Her forgiving spirit at length conquered, and she was able, after a time, to say morning and evening prayers aloud. Her companions either joined in the prayers or kept a respectful silence.

During the days that immediately followed her arrival Victoire was allowed to see her friends freely. The jailer, who called her the "angel of the house," knew that there was nothing to fear from this willing and cheerful captive; but the popularity of the young religious in the town where she had lived so long at length alarmed the authorities. "They feared that the people might arise, so much was she beloved," says Madame de Silguy, and orders were given to prevent her from receiving visits. Only her sister was, with much difficulty, permitted to see her once a week.

Madame de Silguy was then living at "Le Mesmeur," a country house about twelve miles from Quimper, and it is to her written account that we owe all we know of Victoire's stay in the Quimper prison. Her days were devoted to instructing, consoling or nursing her fellow-sufferers; her gayety amazed them and was a standing lesson of heroic submission. It breaks forth in a charming letter that is addressed to her nephew, Jean Marie de Silguy. "You know," she writes, "the tragic adventure of your poor black aunt—*ta pauvre tantine noire*. She recommends herself to your prayers and begs you to ask God to give her patience. Say every day very devoutly an Our Father and a Hail Mary for her intentions, not to ask for her deliverance, but to beg that whatever happens may be the most agreeable to God and the best for her soul. Goodby; I love you and embrace you with all my heart. If I go to heaven first, I will pray for you that you may become a saint. Your Aunt Victoire, prisoner for Jesus Christ."

Although every word she spoke and every line she wrote breathes her ardent longing to die for her faith, Victoire regretted being deprived of the sacraments. She had a great wish to go to confession before she was transferred to Paris, and she made a novena to St. Francis Xavier for this intention. Her prayer was heard. On March 17 she was able to make her confession to the Abbé Riou, curé of Labahan, a faithful priest, who was that very day to die on the scaffold for having refused to take the oath.

A few hours before the good "curé's" execution the jailer allowed our heroine to speak to him. She relates the incident in a letter to Madame de Larchantel, which she was able to convey to her friend concealed in a reel of cotton. The undertaking was by no means an easy one. Victoire was not allowed to enter the room where the priest was imprisoned with others, but she was able to

communicate with him through the door, and his fellow-prisoners obligingly stood aside, that she might feel more free. After describing the scene to her friend, she adds with her usual good humor: "After all, I should not have cared if they heard me, so long as I managed to make my confession. Happily, I was able to do so through the door—*plus en gros qu'en detail*—in general rather than in detail, it is true, but God knows my heart and also my circumstances. This good absolution filled me with joy; it gave me strength, and I consider it as a special grace that was sent to prepare me for other trials."

She could not refrain from a feeling of envy when she spoke of the priest who even then was in sight of the eternal shore: "I own that my sacrifice is made and that I should have been overjoyed had I been allowed to go with him to the scaffold."

She knew that any day she might be summoned to Paris, although she had in a letter to Fouquier-Tinville begged to be judged at Brest. "If my request is granted," she adds, "you will spare yourself much expense and spare me much fatigue. My weak health and my want of experience make it impossible for me to perforce so long a journey on horseback."

But, on the whole, these minor details mattered little to her. With her heart so firmly fixed on what she knew would be the crowning grace of her short life, Victoire was occupied in preparing for future emergencies by a good use of the present. Her charity towards her fellow-sufferers was unbounded. She gave them the provisions that were sent to her by her friends and kept for her own use the coarse prison food. One of these faithful friends once sent her a picture of her uncle, Mgr. de St. Luc, painted by herself, which had been saved from destruction. Her joy was great. She knelt down before the picture to thank her uncle, whose prayers, she felt convinced, had procured for her the grace of martyrdom. In her spare moments she made rings with her hair and little reliquaries that she sent as remembrances to her friends. On her sister she bestowed a more precious gift—the pages that she had written in prison and in which her longing for a martyr's crown breaks out at every line.

She was anxious only about her parents, and knowing that in the eyes of her tyrants she was more guilty than they were, her great desire was to separate her cause from theirs. "This is the only thing that touches me, for as far as I alone am concerned I am only too happy to suffer for the name of Jesus Christ. My lot is worthy of envy, and I now look forward to the happiness that I have always longed for."

It seemed likely at one moment that Victoire would be the only

member of her family to perish. She was a nun and her name had appeared in the trial of the so-called "conspirators" as the worker and distributor of a "seditious emblem," whereas M. and Madame de St. Luc were merely guilty of being "aristocrates," and their age and infirmities might plead in their favor.

However, one day in March, 1794, the jailer's voice thundered through the prison: "Mademoiselle de St. Luc, your parents have arrived!" and almost immediately Madame de St. Luc appeared, supported by two persons, and followed by her husband, who lay on a stretcher. Madame de Silguy happened to be with Victoire, and she has described the scene. The two sisters rushed forward and, bursting into tears, kissed the hands of their parents. "My dear children," said the old man, "I am not weeping from unhappiness, but from joy at seeing you once more before I die." His wife even then preserved her quiet dignity. "Why are you so distressed," she said, "we are proud to share the imprisonment and the chains of Jesus Christ's confessors." The young English sailors who were present were struck by the tone of the words, whose meaning they could not understand. They asked for an explanation, and, according to Madame de Silguy, they were so impressed by what they heard that they wrote down the incident "in a journal that they kept of the events of their captivity."

Monsieur and Madame de St. Luc spent ten days at Quimper, during which their daughters did their best to make their imprisonment less painful. Madame de Silguy hardly left the prison, almost forgetting, she owns, "the existence of her husband and children." She adds that Victoire suffered keenly at the thought of her parents' hardships; her tender heart was wrenched when she saw those whom she loved best deprived of the barest necessities of life.

At last orders were given to remove to Paris not only our heroine, but her father and mother and four other persons. They were to start on the 4th of April, and it was suggested at first that the journey should be performed in open carts or on horseback, but after much trouble and probably at the cost of much expense, M. and Madame de St. Luc were allowed to use a borrowed carriage. Nevertheless, the journey, that lasted twenty-five days, was extremely painful. The prisoners at every halt were lodged in the public prison and prevented from speaking to any one, and M. de St. Luc's helplessness and infirmities increased the hardships of the weary pilgrimage. The memoirs of the day are full of harrowing descriptions of these tragic journeyings. Along the high roads of the terror-stricken country might be seen carts or carriages in which the future victims of the "guillotine" were closely packed. They were guarded by the gendarmes of the district through which

they passed, and, curiously enough, among the hundreds who were thus taken to Paris to certain death, very few, if any, attempted to escape. On the eve of her departure Victoire was able to send to her superioress, Madame de Marigo, a letter that has been preserved: "We start to-morrow, Friday, in a wretched carriage that has been lent to my parents. . . . Nothing can add to the sufferings that we have endured here. The worst criminals could not be treated more ill, but the testimony of our conscience and the thought of Jesus, our Master, who suffered for us, is our consolation and support. . . . The prospect of this frightful journey is more alarming than the guillotine, which will only last one moment, but we must drink the chalice to the dregs. . . . The time of the Passion, which we are entering, is well filled to strengthen our hearts to endure a journey that will be a long agony. It will, however, prepare us for the bloody sacrifice to which we are probably called. May the miseries of time save us from those of eternity. . . . Goodby, dear friends, till eternity. All I regret is that I did not make better use of the means of perfection that were given to me when I lived in your holy company; but I rest in the mercy of God, who will, I trust, accept all this as an expiation and penance for my sins. Goodby."

Madame de Silguy, from whose life of her sister we have gathered the details of her imprisonment at Quimper, is necessarily more brief as regards her last journey to Paris and final sacrifice. The archives of "Finistère" inform us that with the St. Lucs traveled two unmarried sisters named Laroque, probably related to the Laroque-Tremaria; a woman named Benoît and a young man, M. de St. Alonarn.

Only on April 29 did the harassed travelers make their entrance into the great city, where during those months of horror the guillotine was in daily use and terror reigned supreme. They were taken to the Conciergerie, whose sinister-looking towers still rise on the left bank of the Seine, close to the Ste. Chapelle.

The "anteroom of the guillotine," as the Conciergerie was justly called, was then closely packed with prisoners, of whom thirty, forty or fifty were daily brought before the revolutionary tribunal close by, judged with an utter disregard for the simplest legal forms, condemned to death for crimes of which they were often not informed, and that same afternoon hurried away to execution.

All the great names of France are inscribed on the death roll of the Conciergerie. During two months, in August and September, 1793, the Queen, Marie Antoinette, was a close prisoner, guarded day and night in one of its most wretched cells, and only eight days after the arrival of the St. Lucs the Princess Elizabeth

was brought there from the Temple to be, on May 10, guillotined on the Place Louis XV. Madame de Silguy succeeded, after the Revolution, in gathering some particulars of her parents' last weeks on earth from those of their fellow-prisoners who were fortunate enough to escape death. Although we long to know more, we are told enough to give us a picture of their dignified and devout demeanor during their stay in the overcrowded prison, a hell on earth, where the blanks made by the day's execution were speedily filled up by new arrivals from the provinces.

The De St. Lucs spent their time in prayer and meditation. We are told that they prayed incessantly and that their days were an earnest preparation for the summons that might come at any moment. "They meditated continually," says their daughter, on the "eternal years," and repeated every day the prayers for the departing soul "with great fervor." Faithful to the charitable habits formed in happier days, they divided the little that they still possessed with their destitute fellow-sufferers. Victoire, it appears, was often seen writing, but no line from her hand ever reached her sisters after her arrival in Paris; only two weeks after her execution they were brought some rings made by her with her own and her parents' hair during her stay at the Conciergerie.

A last trial awaited her before the final sacrifice. For some unknown reason she was separated from her father and mother for a couple of weeks and removed to another part of the prison. When the parents and their child met again it was on the 19th of July, in presence of the revolutionary tribunal.

Only two days before the Blessed Carmelites of Compiègne had appeared in the same court. Like our heroine, they were accused of "fanatism" and of having given away pictures of the Sacred Heart.

The tenor of the charges brought against M. and Madame de St. Luc was sufficient to inform those who were accustomed to Fouquier-Tinville's methods that for them there was no chance of escape. They were accused of being associated with a conspiracy of whom the two brothers, Laroque-Tremaria, were the chiefs; moreover, one of their sons had emigrated; Monsieur de St. Luc's brother had been Bishop of Quimper; consequently, according to Revolutionary logic, the whole family was the enemy of the Revolution and had evidently conspired against the Republic. Victoire was even more deeply compromised. She is pointed out as being a nun, a "Dame de la Retraite," and is accused of having painted and distributed pictures of the Sacred Heart, a seditious emblem.

It is difficult to realize the confusion and utter illegality of the proceedings of the revolutionary tribunal during the last weeks

of the Reign of Terror. Prisoners charged with "conspiracy" were not allowed to offer any defence. A youth of seventeen named St. Pern, who was judged with Victoire de St. Luc, was condemned upon an act of accusation drawn up against his own father. The boy and his mother protested; the judges recognized that he was **only seventeen** and that the charges were brought against a man over forty, but the latter not being forthcoming, his son was condemned and executed in his stead.

In these conditions the trials were necessarily brief. In the case of our heroine and her companions, the sentence was death within twenty-four hours, and at midday the prisoners came out of court.

At 4 o'clock the same afternoon, after their hands had been tied and their hair cut short by the executioner, they were packed in the rough carts that were drawn up into the paved court called "Cour de Mai," that is comparatively untouched at the present day. Here on the broad staircase that still exists was generally gathered an excited crowd. The "furies" of the guillotine were there to insult the prisoners, as with difficulty, owing to their bound arms, they mounted into the carts.

The annals of her institute tell us that Victoire, whose religious vocation had been determined by her love for souls, was even then absorbed by the needs of her companions. Among them was the young Marquis de Cornulier, whom the injustice of his sentence drove to rebellion. He had lately married, and the thought of leaving his young wife added to his despair. Victoire devoted herself to him. Her helpful words, sweet sympathy and, above all, her example did their work, and he ended by accepting his fate in a truly Christian spirit.

Then began the weary drive, under the July sun, along the Paris streets, an excited mob always surrounding the carts that jogged heavily over the long Rue St. Antoine to the Place du Trône. The guillotine had lately been transferred to this remote quarter on account of the pestilential odors of the blood-drenched soil of the Place Louis XV.

But unknown to their enemies, a consolation awaited the prisoners. Most of them, the St. Lucs among others, had been to confession more than once during their stay at the Conciergerie, where many zealous priests, M. Emery, among others, were prisoners themselves and able to minister to the spiritual necessities of their fellow-sufferers. Other priests, regularly appointed by the ecclesiastical chiefs of the Paris Diocese, were ready, closely disguised, to absolve the victims as they passed on their way to execution. One of these devoted ecclesiastics was on duty each day of the week. Tradition reports that they generally stood on the steps of the Church SS.

Paul and Louis, where the prisoners were secretly informed to expect them. Some forty years ago died an old woman who remembered as a child having seen the disguised priests standing at their post when the carts drove slowly by.

On arriving at the foot of the scaffold Victoire, says her sister, asked to die before her parents. "Dear father and mother," she said, "you taught me how to live; with God's grace, I will now teach you how to die," and she smilingly bent her head beneath the knife. Her body was thrown, with the rest, into the sand pit at Picpus, where 1,300 headless corpses were thrust between the 14th of June and the 27th of July, 1794. The Carmelites of Compiègne and the great ladies of the old régime, nobles and peasants, old and young, rest there under the overhanging trees of a quiet cemetery, one of the most solemn spots in twentieth century Paris.

But if Victoire's remains are buried in a common grave, her memory stands out distinctly in the annals of her order and in the hearts of her religious sisters. When peace was restored, Madame de Marigo, her beloved superioress, gathered together her scattered flock and reorganized the institute on a firm basis.

Since then its rules have been modified to suit the requirements of the day, and only three years ago, in July, 1909, they were solemnly approved by Rome. Victoire de St. Luc's spirit still lives in the congregation where she received her religious training and where her portrait and her writings are lovingly preserved.

She and her parents were among the last victims of the "Terror." They perished on July 19. Just nine days later the downfall of Robespierre put an end to the nightmare that held France spell-bound.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

Paris, France.

MONTECASSINO—THE INNER HOUSE OF THE BEAUTIFUL.

IN this age of universal wandering every traveler is anxious for a new sensation. We have trodden the well-known travel ways till their very beauties pall with familiarity, and the call of the timeless East, ever more insistent as distance is lessened by travel facilities, lures the wayfarer from the playground of Europe to the lotus land of antiquity. Yet even in the everyday lands of journeying there remain spots unspoiled by the arch-antipathies of

the thoughtful traveler—advertisement and popularity. To many of us certain journeys or distant pilgrimages loom high in our mind's eye—the blue hills of our fancy upon the horizon of imagination. In some cases their realization exceeds the anticipation, in others it falls short of the ideal, possibly because when accomplished years or disillusionments have lessened our capacity for enthusiasm. Happy the traveler who has chosen for his chateau en Espagne a visit to Montecassino, that citadel of the beautiful which, guarded by its mountain fastnesses, lies almost unknown in a central travel way of a much-traveled country. For him who has stormed its cyclopean heights there is no possibility of disappointment, no *via media* of appreciation. On descending at the tiny station of Cassino, half-way between Rome and Naples, the doors of an inner house of beauty open before him, revealing pure, æsthetic delights. As in every undertaking, it is the first step in the journey that counts, that of deciding to scale the mountain of the treasure house of memories—a very cloud-kingdom it appears as seen from below! Once embarked upon, this pilgrim's progress assumes far less formidable proportions than anticipated. Roomy country carriages, drawn by horses jingling with bells, wait outside the station for possible customers, and when we have trusted ourselves to one of these conveyances and started fairly on the upward journey, the path of travel seems ideal.

The mountain jehu laughs to scorn the plain-dwellers' ideas of the formidability of the ascent, while the lean steeds, as if to corroborate his confidence, bowl us along the road at a pace which speaks well for their wiriness. Italy reigns unquestionably as the queen of mountain highways, for her mountain roads, the inheritance of the grand old Roman roadmakers who paved the world's highways, are the constant admiration of travelers. Broad, smooth, tree-shaded, mounting rapidly yet easily upward, as it winds like a fair white ribbon round the mountain side, this road to Montecassino is one magnificently gradual unfolding of a wonder-kingdom. Nature, having reserved it for us as compensation for deserting the haunts of men to dwell with her in solitude, vouchsafes it only by gradual degrees. With each turn of the highroad we leave earth farther beneath us, while the panoramic vision widens into endless horizons. Towns and villages, perched on picturesque heights, recede into a bird's-eye distance. Even a ruined mediæval fortress on a high jutting rock, which looked grimly isolated seen from the little town below, sinks almost to the level of the plains, stretching illimitable in vastness to the sea. The air grows finer and more invigorating every moment. Still we mount, shrubs and leafy hedges forming the sole barrier between us and ravines giddy

enough to turn heads accustomed even to mountain travel. Despite the fact that we seem to be driving literally into cloudland, where the hill-chains are dwarfed and the features of the landscape below have melted into sunlit mistiness, the great monastery-fortress, soaring elusive on its height, appears distant as ever after more than an hour's ascent.

Beyond all description is the luxuriance of southern vegetation, where every slope is green and tree-clad with the delicate green of perpetual springtime. As we repeatedly encircle the mountain in the windings of the road the four great sides of Montecassino stand out in turn, mightily impregnable, a *Turris Fortitudinis* (like that which forms the coat-of-arms of the monastery) to beckon us upward from the alluring beauties of earth. Here and there a signpost, so to speak, marks the way, such as a tiny wayside chapel or a wooden cross standing out clear-cut against the sky, or a wide-open platform free of trees, from which fathoms below opens a prospect of mountain heights and plains, ocean-like, almost terrifying in their vastness! . . . One thinks on this spot of the German Emperor, that most faithfully devoted of Montecassino's many admirers, who in his frequent visits would invariably order his motor to be stopped on this view-platform, where the panoramic vistas stretch widest before the gaze, so that he could contemplate at leisure the fair Italian landscape, drinking it in eagerly, almost hungrily, with the beauty-loving eyes of the artist. Ambition, empire and statecraft are nothing for the moment contrasted with this most glorious *Sursum Corda* which nature vouchsafes to poor humanity.

After innumerable windings one looks finally upward, to meet only a prospect of thickly-wooded rocky heights, once the Grove of Apollo. Yet we are near the summit, passing immediately under still invisible monastery walls, till suddenly a curve in the road reveals the majestic extent of the monastic buildings, no longer a distant promise, but a noble fulfillment. A few moments later and we have descended at the original ancient gateway to enter the precincts, making the remainder of the short, steep ascent to the monastery door on foot. A grandly-arched portal forms the entrance to Montecassino, in whose vicinity are the *forestieria* or guest-quarters. The beautiful Benedictine motto of *Pax*, carved in high relief over the doorway, augurs well for the shelter which as strangers and pilgrims we are about to beg from the sons of St. Benedict. It is like a return to the Middle Ages, when hospitality was counted among the virtues and the gates of the monasteries, the homes of religion and learning, were thrown open with splendid generosity to receive student, wayfarer and pilgrim

alike. Nor were our expectations disappointed. Nothing could exceed the cordiality of the Benedictine welcome, given us in the name of the arch abbot by the padre forestiero, or guest-father, on the monastic threshold, for the world-famed Benedictine hospitality knows no time or place even in these straitened modern days. Men guests are allowed to stay within the monastery, while women (who must be outside the monastic precincts at the sunset Angelus) are accommodated at the farm house, a few minutes' walk from the monastery. No charge for accommodation is ever made, but surely no visitor to Montecassino forgets to leave the equivalent for his lodging in the unobtrusive box left at the doorway for donations. . . . Our arrival was at a busy time, when the boys were returning to college after the holidays, and the guest-quarters crowded. However, thanks to the exertions of that kindest and most thoughtful of guest-fathers, room was found for us all, and the satisfaction of our little band of wayfarers on being allowed admittance to the promised land knew no bounds. Indeed, the entrance within the monastery precincts on that September morning was but the beginning of two days of rarely unalloyed pleasure such as are few and far between in this everyday world. The first sight of Montecassino is almost unexpectedly striking, for on the summit of this mountain height such a wealth of architectural magnificence, carried out with so lavish a hand, must come in the nature of a surprise. From the shadow of the mediaeval gateway begins an apparently endless vista of colonnaded cloisters, for a succession of three splendid courts, around which the college and monastic buildings cluster, constitute a triple atrium to the cathedral church, a veritable triumph of architecture, constructed by that prince of Italian courtyard builders, Bramante, to whom the Renaissance owes so many a gem. The monastery raven (kept in all Benedictine monasteries, in honor of St. Benedict's faithful dumb companion, who, according to tradition, first guided the saint to these mountain fastnesses) holds court in the grassy spaces of the first courtyard, greeting visitors with a bright-eyed interrogative turn of the head and a welcoming chirp. The bird lovers of our party, enchanted with this genus loci of the spot, were fain to pursue him with seductive wiles, but the venerable sable-hued bird discouraged further infringements on monastic discipline by retiring in dignified state to perch on an antique Greek vase, where he formed a classic picture.

From this outer court open the magnificent sunlit vistas of the central courtyard of honor, with its lofty colonnades crowned by broad, open terraces, appropriately called the Loggie del Paradiso from the peerless view commanded from their summit. On one

side rise the monastery buildings, on the other the college. Long ago Montecassino was declared a national monument held by the State; but the Benedictine Fathers have been allowed to remain under their roof tree of centuries as custodians of the college, the monastery and the most precious library and archives. It is difficult to particularize in Montecassino's Inner House of Beauty, each feature seen in succession appearing to bear away the palm. One returns, however, often here, in the sunlight of this noblest atrium of the Monks of the West, to linger by the beautiful old well, with its architrave and Corinthian columns, absorbing the supreme picturesqueness of the scene that we may carry it away in our minds. The sunlight pours fiercely on court and fountain and white monastic building; but on either side stretch cloistered colonnades, cool and shadowy in their dim perspective, while the great flight of massive steps which lead to the abbey church rise high before us to meet the five-arched doorways above. The colossal statues of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica at the foot of the steps, touched by the sunshine with flickering lights and shadows which seem to make them almost human, brood over the scene with the perpetual peace St. Benedict won so hardly with a life's renunciation, a peace which no storm of centuries can mar or break. "Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini" is engraved under the statue of the Benedictine founder, a tender play of words from Holy Writ on the name of the Patriarch of the Benedictines. His feet were beautiful indeed upon these mountain tops, and that benediction lingers, to render his dwelling a tower of eternal refuge. After scaling the mighty stairs, still another atrium remains before reaching the church, an atrium with antique oriental granite columns, preserved from the Temple of Apollo, which once crowned these mountain heights. It is known as the benefactors' cloister, for grouped around the threshold of the abbey they loved stand statues in niches of Popes and emperors or other great personages who have been spiritual or temporal benefactors to Montecassino throughout the centuries, beginning appropriately with Anicius Euprobis, the Roman patrician, father of St. Benedict, and Abbonanza, his mother, who surely bestowed upon the abbey its highest benefit in the person of its founder.

One reads many a name famous in the pages of history on passing this silent company of immortals, a complete dynasty, spiritual and temporal, widely diversified in character as in epoch, yet one in their love of this glorious shrine. The royal atrium is an appropriate preparation for the splendors of the abbey church, whose bronze doors of eleventh century work open on a revelation of richness so diffused, of harmony so perfect, that the eye is rather

soothed than dazzled by its intense restfulness. Over all Benedictine shrines, Gothic or Renaissance, primevally simple or rich to the verge of gorgeousness, there is a certain similarity, a far-off echo, so to speak, of the Benedictine Pax, which their founder sent ringing down the centuries. Yet Montecassino in its fifteen centuries of existence has passed through vicissitudes enough to wreck any edifice of secular institution. Destroyed by Lombards and Saracen, ravaged by earthquake shocks, the magnificent abbey was repeatedly restored, till the eighteenth century restoration completed the glorious heritage of to-day.

Those who can see no beauty except in Gothic edifices will criticize the style of architecture and its over-floridity of decoration, while missing the perfection of color-harmonies and the distribution of richness which render the abbey-cathedral so peerless. Grandly impressive stretches the perspective of the vast interior, with its symphony of soaring arches, the classic columns of oriental granite and the mystic golden distances of St. Benedict's splendid shrine. Its whole effect, from roof to walls, is like the wide-open page of an illuminated mediæval missal, in softly-blended yet brilliant tints, an agglomeration of gold, jewels and pictures woven into a rich mosaic of color. It is no exaggeration to say that this abbey-church of Montecassino, though smaller, is richer and more gorgeous than St. Peter's in Rome, with the accumulation of precious stones that line its walls. Chapel after chapel, decorated with painting, fresco and sculpture, tells the history of Montecassino and its great founder, in the eloquent language of art, to be understood by every race and tongue. One longs for leisure to examine thoroughly the details of the art scheme, where every minutest decoration is a separate gem. For instance, only one feature illustrates the perfection of the florid Renaissance, the sacristy doorway, which, if removed from its environment, would enrich the meanest edifice by its wealth of decoration, fluted columns of alabaster with Corinthian columns, a sculptured marble frieze and a surround of mosaics on a precious marble background. Veritably, it is a doorway to dream of in an artist's dream of fairest surroundings, a portal worthy of the Inner House where even the most hurried must linger to admire.

At intervals in Montecassino, as the feast of spiritual and æsthetic richness is poured out in copious libations as from the very horn of plenty, one is forced to pause to cry out, "Enough! Enough! Let us linger here until we have assimilated at least a small part of the beauty which would suffice for the art-education of a life-time!" However, our Benedictine guides, with a smile inscrutable, still lead us swiftly upward from height to height, knowing that

their treasure-house is well nigh inexhaustible. By a flight of matchless mosaic steps, raising it from the level of the church, one reaches the central shrine, the quiet spot where the remains of St. Benedict and his beloved twin-sister Scholastica were laid, in which, most of all in these vast monastic precincts, the universal Benedictine Pax recurs insistently. Here one realizes the full meaning of the mediæval word sanctuary, where all is peace and no strife or violence can enter. Passing footsteps fall softly on the many-hued marble pavement, and voices are hushed unconsciously in a shrine where the richness of all the ages meets and mingles. Coral and jasper, mother-of-pearl and amethyst, the Monks of the West have scattered these unfading flowers lavishly upon their founder's tomb, so that they may keep watch together with soft-burning lamps, whose radiance, never extinguished, falls on the quaintly-curious Latin inscription above the shrine:

Benedict and Scholastica!
Born in one birth on earth.
One tomb receives their mortal remains for eternity.
United in one sole love with God in heaven.

Splendid Renaissance monuments adorn the sanctuary walls, but they seem almost superfluous here, at the resting place of the one great personality which vitalized this spot, whose life-work enabled this architectural masterpiece to be raised to the glory of God. Time flies more relentlessly at Montecassino than elsewhere, so that before we can even cursorily examine some of the art treasures the guest-father (kindly mindful of body as well of mind) comes to carry us off from the æsthetic to everyday necessities, otherwise midday dinner in the guests' refettorio, where, in company with other visitors enjoying Montecassino hospitality, we find ourselves ready to do justice to the monastic fare so plentifully provided. A cosmopolitan gathering assembled around the monastery table that autumn morning, and as our kind Benedictine hosts imposed no cloistral silence, a very Babel of tongues arose during the repast! America, England, France, Germany and Sicily were represented—a veritable Peace Congress assembled as guests under St. Benedict's hospitable roof. Good humor and geniality were the order of the day, as strangers drawn together with the camaraderie of travelers and pilgrims, talked in various languages over the day's experiences, while the lay Brothers looked after our comfort with friendly care.

Afterwards we wandered a while on the most glorious Loggie del Paradiso, drinking in the matchless prospect from their heights. From this spot the world of towns and cities seems irrevocably separated, while the distant panorama embraces not only the extent of monastic domain, with its wooded confines, but the kingdoms

of land, sky and mountain beyond, stretching in ocean-like distances and almost with the ocean's restful charm, joined to a mountain air whose purity is absolutely life-giving.

The deep-toned Vesper bells found us once again in the abbey church, where the organ was pealing out grandly over the majestic spaces. We stood watching the long defile of black-robed monks, dignified and stately in their flowing habits, descend from the choir at the end of Vespers, and this procession seemed the last touch needed to realize the supreme beauty of the dreamlike edifice in its highest end, that of divine worship. After Vespers a lay Brother brought us a message from the arch-abbot that he would receive us in the sacristy, and we hastened to obey the summons so graciously accorded. American travelers, more than any other, feel altogether at home at Montecassino, owing to the fact that the present illustrious arch-abbot, Most Rev. Boniface Krug, is American by birth. His unfailing kindness to his country people will never be forgotten by those who have experienced his genial welcome to the roof-tree of St. Benedict.*

It was a memorable moment when we stood in the presence of the Lord Abbot for the first time. His venerable personality seems an integral part of Montecassino. Each stone of its mighty fabric is dear to him, while his years of companionship with its art treasures serves but to deepen his appreciation of their value, to which he himself has so ably contributed, in the decorations of the crypt. Like so many men of the highest intellect and attainments, this distinguished Benedictine is frankly simple, utterly unaffected in manner. Tall, dignified, more energetic in his movements than many younger men and unbent with the weight of years he carries so lightly, the venerable prelate, whose unmistakable asceticism is tempered with great human sympathy, embodies the highest type of churchman and religious. Any one who has been fortunate enough to be guided by the arch-abbot through the grandest of all Benedictine monasteries can realize to some extent the rich store of learning and artistic genius which, had he not been a religious, would have won him distinction in the art world. Under his illuminating guidance Montecassino became an actual revelation, not only from the artistic point of view, but of the deeper spiritual meaning which underlies every detail of its art, and our pilgrimage through it brought fresh insight at every step. Only a brief glimpse could be accorded before leaving the church to the incomparable choir stalls, a feast of Renaissance wood-carving, absolutely perfect in workmanship, overflowing in detail. In any other place each one

* Since the above was written Arch-Abbot Krug, of Montecassino, has died.

would be a separate marvel, but here they only form a detail of the mighty whole. Passing into a long cloister where the monastery precincts begin, one enters the lofty paneled chapter house, with its eighteenth century paintings; then on to the magnificent library appropriately presided over by sculptured busts of learned doctors of the Benedictine Order. In this home of ancient learning some rare treasures of the printer's earliest art are jealously preserved, such as the *Rationalis Divinorum Codex Officiorum*, printed on parchment by one of the first three inventors of printing, John Faust, of Magonza, in 1459. Then a priceless treasure in the shape of the second book printed in Italy, the works of Lattantius, printed at the first Italian printing press at the Monastery of Subiaco in 1465 by Conrad Sweynhem and Arnold Panarzs. With these are various other heirlooms, over which bibliophiles would lovingly pore. "The Story of Rome," by Titus Livius, printed in 1472; the "Expositiones Librorum Novi Testamenti" of Nicola de Lyra, of the same year; the "Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great," the "Rule of St. Benedict," the "Speculum of the Abbot Bernard," of 1505, and the "Letters of St. Catherine of Siena," printed at the Aldo Manuzio Press in 1500. This literary shrine contains more than five hundred printed works of the first century of printing. Passing the picture gallery, with its exquisite wood-carvings, one must needs linger perforce in the grand old sixteenth century refectory before the startlingly impressive wall fresco of the miracle of the loaves and fishes by Bassano, a rich feast of Venetian art. Admiring its glowing beauty comes the regret that only the careless eyes of schoolboys rest on this splendid work, instead of the Benedictines who formerly used the refectory. Scarcely less interesting are the ample proportions of the noble kitchen of eleventh century architecture, a fine relic of the mediæval monastery. Indeed, months would be needed to explore this veritable little world of Montecassino, which we strive to realize in a few short days. Traversing stairways and corridors innumerable, we came at last into the monastic stillness of the prior's cloister, a tiny architectural gem, classically severe, which serves as a forerunner to prepare the mind for Montecassino's proudest possession—the priceless archives, which students from many lands come to study and consult. How few collections of archives can boast the antiquity of these, from the fifth century to the twentieth, for it was founded by St. Benedict himself; and these fifteen centuries of monastic learning have accumulated for posterity an enviable literary heritage, whose very recital would bring a pang of envy to litterateurs. Three vaulted halls contain the archives, the most important MSS. being shown in open cases, such as the "Commentaries" of Origen "on the Epistles of St.

Paul," translated by Rufinus, of the fifth century; the Four Gospels of the time of Pope Zachary, eighth century; the grandly illuminated Missal of the Abbot Desiderius, eleventh century, and the "Divine Comedy" of Dante, with marginal and interlineal notes contemporary with the poet. Literally one realizes that there is nothing new under the sun, looking at one of the literary treasures, "De Origine Rerum," of Rabano Mauro, a folio MS. of A. D. 1000, perhaps one of the earliest specimens extant of that familiar and indispensable "vade mecum" which we claim as thoroughly modern, the encyclopedia, illustrated with colored pictures. Another gem is the MS. of the "Liber Moraliu" of St. Gregory the Great, with explanations of obscure passages written out by the hand of St. Thomas Aquinas. The Montecassino archives boast a complete school of illumination from the earliest ages of the art, truly exquisite being the collection of illuminated Missals and Antiphonaries, among them the famous Bible of Abbot Desiderius. The Papal, imperial and royal seals, diplomas and parchments dating from the ninth century form a complete historical chronicle of the Abbey of Montecassino, and the illustrious personages connected with its story throughout the ages. To the student, however, the host of MSS., 1,380 volumes in all, among them no fewer than nine Palimpsests, are the richest and most important feature of the House of Archives. Many a world-renowned student has worked and lingered lovingly over his work in these halls of ancient learning, where the shadow of the past falls gravely yet gently. Among the more modern scholars who labored here was the learned Benedictine, Abbot Tosti; and the book of students, amid many celebrated and now valuable signatures, bears William Ewart Gladstone's fine, bold signature, side by side with a Latin verse signed in John Henry Newman's clear, minute writing. A portrait of the German Emperor, with an affectionate autograph inscription in a characteristic hand, hangs in a place of honor on the archive walls in memory of his various visits here. It seems to me that William II. must always be at his best in Montecassino; not the Emperor, the politician, the fiery imperialist, but the real man and friend, the disciple in the royal path of learning which so many world-tired feet have gratefully trodden. An atmosphere of utter restfulness pervades this archive treasury, as if the mellowed knowledge of the ages concentrated here had laid the soothing hand of wisdom on humanity's shoulder to teach it the lesson of immortality. The air is redolent as with the breath of a forest from the cypress wood of the bookcases lining the walls, and outside the windows stretches an incomparable prospect of nature's loveliness. Remote on its mountain height from the noise of men, as if buried in a Libyan

desert, it is truly a temple of peace, where student and booklover dwell happily in literary fields elysian, where the golden apples of this stingless tree of knowledge hang ripe and ready to their gleaning hand.

As the shrine of St. Benedict is to the religious, so to the litterateur the archives are the crowning glory of Montecassino. He would fain stay his steps here, more than content to linger with his pilgrimage fulfilled; but the artist must still press onward to find his Parnassus in the Tower of St. Benedict, the sanctuary beautiful of the Beuron school of art. This most interesting spot within the cloister precincts, new in its decorations, is yet the oldest corner of Montecassino, for it is the site of the cell where St. Benedict lived his daily life in the sixth century, and forms a feature apart from the rest of the monastery, not only from the interest of its associations, but as a luminous example of the highest degree of spiritualized art ever attained by any modern school of painting. The famous German Art School of Beuron Abbey, whose talent has added so greatly to the beauty of Montecassino, caused a considerable interest in the world of contemporary art; but it was on the occasion of the fourteenth centenary of St. Benedict in 1880, when the Tower was excavated and restored, this band of artist-monks came from their German monastery to begin the noblest art work which will hand down their name to posterity so worthily. No description or preconceived opinion can convey any idea of the beauty of these glorious frescoes covering the walls of the inner house of St. Benedict's early dwelling. What renders the magnificent art-sequence so important is the fact that it presents a pictorial embodiment of the whole rule and spirit of the Benedictine Order, conceived and executed wholly by Benedictine hands, aided by the divine spark of genius with its infinite capacity for painstaking, yet energized by a love of the work only possible to those who live by the inner mainspring of St. Benedict's life.

The first impression on entering the Tower of St. Benedict is its aloofness, so to speak, from what has gone before. Throughout its vast extent Montecassino forms a mighty symphony, with the spirit of its founder's life-work running through it like the *leit motif*. In some parts of the composition, such as the Baroque decorations, it is almost overpoweringly insistent, in others weaving subtle art harmonies, florid and intricate; but here in the Tower of St. Benedict it breathes the inspiration of a living prayer. From the very threshold one is aware of entering on the study of a phase of art uncommon as it is beautiful. It might be said that the Beuron fresco work of Montecassino is too transcendently ideal, too rigid in its forms to conform to the canons of modern art; yet it is

altogether appropriate in this place, the sublime idealism of its conception coming with absolute relief to the eye, jaded by the careless realism of the present-day impressionist school. There is undeniably a Byzantine, even an archaic element, in the frescoes of the Tower of St. Benedict—an endeavor to convey their lesson in as few lines and with the minimum amount of detail compatible with effect, also to remind the spectator that these are works of art as far removed from earthiness as it is given to human hands to make them. Nor are they contained in one separate sanctuary, but in a succession, leading one from another in a noblest sequence of interest and beauty, culminating in St. Benedict's cell. Each is replete with symbolism. No fresco but what has its part in the parable of the Benedictine founder's life work. The story of his life at Montecassino commences in the Atrium, told in a series of frescoes wrought as a frieze, in softly tender monochrome, wonderfully distinct from the dark wall background, like a bas-relief, so that each scene is indelibly impressed upon the mind. It is a story without words, requiring no key or explanation, even to the most careless observer. The attitude of perfunctory observation is rare, however, at Montecassino. Those who have tasted the beauty of the Inner House become for the time of its household, and every incident connected with it, the simplest as well as the most wonderful, is of strong living interest.

The series of frescoes is continued through another sanctuary, an ante-room, so to speak, to the presence chamber of St. Benedict's inner cell, dim and mystic in soft half-tones of coloring. Its very atmosphere is prayerful, from the majestic white-winged figures of contemplative angels on the walls to the marble doorway, representing in sculptured symbolism the attributes of a perfect prayer, the mainspring of St. Benedict's life work. As if to complete the prayerfulness of environment, the sun rays slant through the perspective of open doorway like a veritable Jacob's ladder leading from the cell. Inside that sunlit sanctuary the Beuron art school finds its highest inspiration. Around the walls of the choir still runs the wonderful minor sequence in "chiaroscuro," but in their midst for the first time comes a note of richest color, a royal figure crowned in "purple and fine linen." Every line of **this fresco** of the Psalmist David is replete with inspiration, for with consummate skill the Benedictine artists have environed it with the halo of the mystery of prophecy, so that it chains the eye by a curious inexplicable insistence. The fingers of the "royal prophet" touch the harp strings lightly till the melody seems almost audible. In his eyes lies the brooding insight of futurity. Instinctively one follows the direction of David's inspired gaze, to meet the frescoed revela-

tion of the Crucifixion, which covers the wall of the inner cell. The words of the prophetic psalm tremble on the air, as if sighing from that tremulously vibrating harp of prophecy. Never, perhaps, since Fra Angelico painted his meditation of the Passion on the cloisters of San Marco has Christian art embodied the Redemption mystery so vividly before the mind. Pathetic human figures stand depicted below the cross; yet we seem to realize but the One Presence hanging in high relief against the luridly darkening sky. Beside the compelling beauty of this masterpiece, radiating color like a living scene, all else seems dim and shadowy, even the white-robed Apocalyptic figures on the arches and the angels on the vaulting, who seem to brood over the spot with snowily-enveloping wings. Every wall has its story, culminating in that exquisitely spiritual fresco of the "Death of St. Benedict." Sombre in tone as contrasted with the mystic glory of the "Crucifixion," this closing scene in the life we have followed in the art-sequence forms an epic poem of Christian art, a subject upon which the Benedictine artists have wrought so lovingly that it stands out as a representative expression of their art. Inexpressibly pathetic is the central figure of the "Patriarch," carried by his last wish to die before the altar. The radiant beauty on the dying aged face is absolutely unearthly, and one seems to watch the dawn of some joy unspeakably wonderful slowly breaking over it. The mingled grief and triumph of the kneeling monks, who bear their founder up as if they could keep him with them by the strength and closeness of their pitiful human clasp, is almost shared by the spectators, so intensely vivid is its representation. A stairway leads down to the lower portion of the cell, beautified by striking wall frescoes, exemplifying the Benedictine rule in its every manifestation of work and prayer, especially interesting being those of monks engaged in the task whose perfection we see in Montecassino to-day—the beautifying of God's house. Another fresco, representing the Benedictine teaching the Christian faith to the pagans, is absolutely classical, more like a Grecian bas-relief than a modern fresco in the grouping of the figures of the listeners, who, dropping their daily tasks, drawn by the irresistible force of the strange new doctrines, stand raptly absorbed in the words of the teacher, each separate head a character study.

Endless is the interest and art value of these frescoed walls, but time inexorable draws us past them to the inner silence of the lower cell where St. Benedict actually lived. Archaic in its simplicity, not flooded by light and color, as is the upper sanctuary, yet this "heart" of Montecassino is the more impressive, where an impressively solemn sculptured figure of the Benedictine founder

dominates the dimly mystic environment. In the peacefulness of the atmosphere of contemplation engendered by the spot the mind goes back over the centuries to the life which was led within these walls, clothing them with the undying vitality left by a strong personality. It is with a sense of leaving the land of vision that we pass out from this tiny art kingdom of surpassing beauty. From the completeness of its art-sequence the traveler might be tempted to imagine that the zenith of Montecassino's decorations had been reached. Yet the realms of contemporary work remain to be penetrated to prove that true art carries within it the well-spring of inspiration. Only when one stands finally in the crypt of Montecassino's abbey church, where a soft glow of light reveals a vision of a "revelation city of jasper and amethyst," is it realized that to the twentieth century has been left the privilege of "painting for eternity" (as Michaelangelo defined mosaic work) the walls of this wonderful building. Its decoration, begun some years ago, originated altogether with the late Arch-abbot of Montecassino, and to the realization of the important art work he brought to bear tireless devotion and religious and artistic inspiration of the highest order, ably seconded by a band of talented religious, with that true artist, Dom Desiderius (the head of the Beuron school of art), as their chief. Under their able hands the crypt is growing daily into a thing of surpassing beauty that few modern art works can rival. The scheme in its entirety forms a triumph of artistic skill, one design and decoration leading into another by such skillful gradations that mosaics, bas-reliefs and marbles mingle in the finished whole, with no sudden contrasts or preponderance of one material or color to break the harmony or suggest overpowering richness. The primary tints of original mosaic work remain as the foundation—red, blue and that intense glowing virginal gold which radiates splendor like sun rays. Added to these come the softer tints of the latter-day mosaic worker's art, less vigorous perhaps than the *opus alexandrinum* of the Middle Ages, yet more æsthetic in nature's colorings of dawn and sunset. One chapel only, for instance, forms a sunset symphony, carried out in two tints—soft, cloudlike grays and amethysts, blended from the palette of the evening sky when the glory of the setting sun has faded. One sees that these Benedictine artists who dwell with the Universal Mother in her sky-girt solitudes follow no set school, but study the splendor of earth and sky from their citadel on the Loggie del Paradiso, where even jealous nature lends them her secrets of color combinations.

Not to pass with too abrupt a transition from the florid architecture of the abbey church to the archaic severity of the crypt, its designers, with supreme artistic intuition, have skillfully fused the styles by covering the walls of the stairway leading from church to crypt by a series of bas-reliefs representing the faithful of all

ages coming in pilgrimage to St. Benedict's tomb. Wonderfully realistic is the effect of the descending figures, standing out in relief, mail-clad knights, kings, monks in flowing habits, the old and the young. It is as if the hard stone walls had miraculously taken life, the vigorous life of a mighty multitude, pressing on to their pilgrimage goal, while above stretch the vast skylike mosaic vaultings, glistening like starlight. One of the most interesting features in connection with the decoration of the crypt is a visit to the power-house, so to speak, of all the beauty upon which our eyes have feasted—the series of workrooms or studios where the valiant little band of Benedictine artists—sculptors, painters and mosaic workers—engaged in the work of the crypt, are originating, designing and executing their artistic work. It is with the feeling of stepping into another world that one finds oneself among the workers under whose skillful hands each separate part of the decorative scheme is nearing completion. An artist would long to paint the picture of this twentieth century Benedictine studio, with its sombre background of monasticism, peopled by black-robed artist-religious. What a departure it would make from the usual studio interiors seen in exhibitions! Here a bearded monk, with that curiously impersonal look of distant absorption often seen on the faces of artists, pauses momentarily from the figure he is sketching in with rapid, skillful touches to incline his head as we pass in courteous greeting. One need scarcely look at the spirited sketch to recognize the true artist, artistic to the finger-tips. Further on a group of religious are engaged in deep consultation over an intricate design for mosaic work, while in a tiny studio by the window—the most striking picture of all—a monk, whose tall figure seems to tower almost majestically in its black draperies against the strong window light, stands putting the finishing touches with his scalpel to the full-length bas-relief study of a crusader, a mailed knight in chain armor, probably one of the kings or emperors who came in pilgrimage to Montecassino. There is a strange contrast between the almost overpowering impression of physical strength in the figure he is carving, and the intense spirituality on the gentle face of the religious who turns to greet the visitor gravely, then resumes his work. Yet the impression conveyed in some curiously convincing manner to the mind is that subject and artist are in utter sympathy, and in both monk and crusader—he of the twelfth and he of the twentieth century—exists the same hidden strength to make them kin, strong to fight the battles of the spirit. . . . This passing silhouette is worthy of being stowed away carefully in our mind-portfolio of Montecassino, together with many recollections of a memorable sojourn.

No matter how long their stay, one must always part reluctantly from Montecassino at last. In our all too brief visit we had but begun to realize the hidden treasure of the Inner House. There is so much to return to, to dwell upon. Each spot revisited means an ever-more appreciated delight, while around the great abbey, and mightily encompassing it, is the radiant, unspoiled face of nature, unveiled for the time to humanity's city-dimmed gaze. No one who has witnessed them can forget the dawns over the plains from Montecassino or the sunsets from the Loggie del Paradiso, where all the beauty of earth and sky seem gathered into a vision of overwhelming splendor.

Memorable, too, were the evening strolls in the soft, gray twilight, when the Angelus bells were ringing from the monastery, reëchoed from the distant campagna, and the quiet passersby wished the wayfarer a *felic notte*, the whole scene forming another embodiment of the Benedictine Pax which greets the stranger so recurrently at Montecassino.

Then came nightfall, inexpressibly solemn on these mountain heights, enveloping the monastic kingdom in a veil of restful silence, till the stars twinkled out as from a new-made firmament over a far-distant, mysterious world, and one looked almost fearfully into the depths of abysmal deserts below. From beginning to end of our stay unfailing was the kindness and consideration we received from every member of the abbey with whom we came into contact; from the old Brother porter, lean and ascetic, who in his vaulted gateway has ever a cheery greeting for the passing guest, up to the Lord Abbot, that most venerable of figures who seemed as he gave us his parting blessing the living embodiment of the Patriarch of the Monks of the West.

One and all made us feel by their gracious Old World courtesy that we were for the time their honored guests, instead of wanderers from the outside world come to disturb their monastic peace. After all these centuries the worthiest sons of St. Benedict rise up and call him blessed in the blessing their busily peaceful life brings to a world whose war cry is restlessness and unrest, moral and physical.

Let those upon whom the wanderlust periodically descends, yet who are sated of ordinary travel, tired above all of the ever-increasing uniformity which renders the ends of the earth alike, go to Montecassino, to dwell for a while, bodily and spiritually, in the pure air of its mountain heights. It is no less a school of religion than of art and ancient learning—a liberal education for those who penetrate the mystic portals, where the lamp of art and learning is lifted high, fed by the white radiance of the flame of faith which

was kindled on these mountains to be a beacon to the ages. He who has studied Montecassino with thought carries its remembrance with him as a thing apart from the everyday world in which our daily lives are spent.

M. D. WALSH.

Rome, Italy.

THE CULT OF ST. COLUMBANUS.

INTEREST in the life and work of St. Columbanus is revived by the action of an American clerical admirer of his, who desires to remain incognito, in offering a thousand dollars for a satisfactory story of his life. It ought to be feasible to get the materials for such a biography. More marvelous than any wonders writ in the pages of romance were the deeds of those great monks who set forth from Ireland to "sell science and wisdom" in the market place to all comers, as the ancient chroniclers quaintly and not inaccurately put the case. It was a credulous age when these venders of knowledge startled the world by the offer of a new panacea. There was a thriving trade in chimeras and quackery. Sea captains used to sail up the Baltic and the Sound for the specific purpose of "buying winds" from reputable "witches" on the coast of Lapland. Other witches dealt in the same uncanny "futures" about the mouth of the Seine. The wind was wanted for some particular voyage when the mariner who needed it expected that in the ordinary course of things mundane his vessel would be becalmed in some stretch of the Indian Ocean or the South Seas. Witches, and male dealers in the uncanny, did, in fact, a thriving trade in the sale of winds and cauls and the casting of spells over men and women and cattle, for the gratification of malice or revenge. So that when strangers appeared on the European Continent proclaiming that their staple merchandise was wisdom and science, the antidotes for superstition and witchcraft, the inhabitants opened their eyes and began to wonder what was to be the outcome of so daring an innovation on the established order of things.

The "wisdom" which these singular merchants offered for sale was not merely worldly; it related to the soul and mind, and was a thing to be sown in the ground and cultivated as plants and flowers were. It was of a sort to change a desert into a garden and cause the savage rocks and sombre forests to disappear from the landscape and give place to the delights of a new Paradise.

Let us take an illustration. On the borderland between Wexford

and Waterford counties, in Ireland, there lay, something less than a century ago, a stretch of barren land at the foot of a range of low hills. It was no good for either man or beast, having no soil and yielding nothing but wild, rank weeds in the crevices of the stony waste. There arrived in the South of Ireland a band of the Monks of La Trappe, expelled from their fatherland, France, by the decree of the immitigable trinity which is styled "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." A kind-hearted landlord, in whose domain lay that stretch of worthless ground, offered it to the exiles, free of rent, if they wished to settle on it. They gratefully closed with the proposal, and the result is seen to-day in the shape of a spacious monastery and a great span of smiling fields with bountiful harvests, all the product of the energies of the men who devote their lives to the service of God in silent prayer and arduous physical labor. The Monks of Mount Melleray and their establishment are famous for their piety, and a hospitality to the wayfarer that never costs him a penny. And this was the sort of "wisdom" which the strangers from distant Ireland went forth into the cities of Europe to sell, in the reign of the great Emperor Charlemagne, who, although fond of having learned men about him, was unable to write his own name, like many of his nobles, until these wisdom merchants from Ireland arrived in his territories to teach them.

It is highly necessary that the story of the life of St. Columbanus be undertaken by competent hands. There is much obscurity as to his early life. His parents' names are not given in the "Lives of the Saints," nor is it stated whether they were "gentle or simple," free or bond. The locality in Ireland in which he first saw the light is not well known. We are merely told that he manifested with the first dawn of reason an inclination to virtue and a desire to acquire knowledge very unusual for his tender years. When he arrived at maturity he found himself exposed to temptations because of his comeliness as a man, and, in order to escape the attentions of some of the female sex, it is stated, he determined, for his soul's sake, to betake himself to a solitary life as a hermit or enter a monastery. He chose the latter course, and for several years studied theology and practiced the Christian virtues of sobriety, austerity and prayer. His probation ended, he resolved to go to France, in compliance with what he considered to be a Divine inspiration. His Abbot, we are told (his name is not given), though loth to part with him, encouraged him in the determination. So with twelve companions he departed for Gaul, and went to the court of the Merovingian princes. He was received by either Sigebert or Chilperic—it has not yet been decided which—cordially, and he and his companions were bidden to go look around and pick out

for themselves a locality wherein to set up their abode. In the depths of the forests at the foot of the Vosges Mountains in Lotharingia they found a spot that answered their ideals of the monastic needs. It was called Anegrai. Here Columbanus began the erection of a little church, which he dedicated to St. Peter; and around it the monks set up their separate huts or cells. The fame of their holy lives and their preaching to the peasantry spread quickly, and it was not long ere the little settlement demanded a more substantial lodgment than wattled huts to accommodate all who came to hear and profit by these saving teachings. The monastery was named Luxeu or Luxeuil.

Among the distinguished visitors who called to see him and his company was King Theodoric of Burgundy. He was leading a very evil life at the time. Columbanus, like St. John the Baptist, admonished him gently but firmly against continuance in such a course; but his words aroused Brunehault, the King's grandmother, to a fury. She maintained an evil influence over the weak monarch by the despicable course of ministering to his evil passions. It was not difficult for her to persuade the weak and dissolute Merovingian to proceed to harsh measures against the man who had the insolence to tell a King of the Franks that he must reform his way of life or pay the penalty. Columbanus had been for twenty years governing the monastery and converting the people around, and there was not an iota of a charge that could be advanced against him or his community. But this fact made no difference to the Herodias of the Merovingian court. Theodoric caused his soldiers to surround the monastery and expel the fearless Irish saint. Fearing that he might draw down the vengeance of the unspeakable Brunehault and her weakling grandson on the whole community, Columbanus went forth from Fountains, where he had lived so long in holy quiet, doing the work of Christ, and on foot made his way toward Lorraine, where ruled Clothaire, another of the descendants of Clovis. By Clothaire he was offered ground whereon to build a new monastery, but he declined the kindness, as he feared, should he accept it, he would expose himself to the fierce vengeance of the evil pair in Burgundy. He traveled along the route of the Rhine and on to the Swiss lakes, toward the city of Milan, where with some companions he preached successfully against the Arian heretics. There he learned of the existence of a church once famous, but then a ruin. Believing that this would be more convenient for a fresh start in the conventual line, he sought and obtained the consent of the King of the Lombards to the plan. This was the beginning of the renowned establishment at Bobbio. The ground was in a wild prairie condition when he

obtained possession of it, but it was not very long until he and his companions had reclaimed it from the abomination of desolation and made it, under the revivifying influence of a genial sky, resemble Paradise rather than Arabia Petrae.

In this connection, it ought to be a curious question for the speculators in possibilities in mundane affairs what must have been the fate of the European soil had not men like those human beavers and ants and bees, "the lazy monks," appeared in the wake of the Goths and Huns and Franks to rescue the deserts which these barbarians had called peace from the hand of decay and the plague. On the plains of Chalons alone, when the Visigoths had shattered the hosts of Attila, the burning of the horses killed in the frightful conflict was an operation that occupied five or six days, and the choking smoke of the holocaust darkened the skies as far as eye could see beyond the plains of blood. A great part of the European continent was, indeed, reduced to a howling wilderness by the marchings and conflagrations of the barbarians. That horrid scene of ruin was retrieved in time; but it was mainly by the patient and devout labor of the denizens of the monasteries that the salvage was ultimately accomplished. Any detailed chronicle of the life of Columbanus and his monastic company must necessarily present the whole picture of his times and the horrid barbarism which it was their lot to confront and overcome. Ireland was, fortunately, somewhat better situated when Patrick set forth on his task of conversion. A good many petty wars had laid waste portions of the island; but the awful Danes had not put in their appearance in any considerable strength. It was the fate of those who were to live a couple of centuries later to face that foe more terrible than even the Hun or Vandal. Had the mission of St. Patrick been postponed until the cycle of the Norsemen, the story of Ireland's conversion must certainly have been widely different from what it is as we know it now.

The case as we find it depicted by reliable writers presents some apparent anomalies. We have it on indubitable authority that Ireland, soon after Patrick's work was done, was honored with the description of the isle of saints and scholars. But for long afterward there existed in it a good many whose lives and works did not correspond to that description. The old druidism was a system 'hat was very difficult to eradicate, and though the woman-kind of Ireland was, as a rule, all that Thomas Davis described them to be in his "Lament for the Milesians"—as fresh as the sea breeze and free from a soil—there were, we know from the ancient bards, a few that were not so. As the learned historian and inquirer found, when going back to the investigation of the

state of society in Ireland immediately before St. Patrick's advent and for some decades, perhaps generations after that event, it was by no means a complete surrender of the old deep-rooted paganism. The young, the pure, the gifted and the single-minded had come from every side to take up the light burden and the sweet yoke of the Saviour of mankind. Still, many of the princes of the land held out against the Divine invitation, preferring earthly ambition to a heavenly reward, and going in for a monopoly of evil-doing. It was among the chieftains principally, almost entirely, that sin prevailed, the clan system, unfortunately, favoring deadly feuds. We may remark, appropriately, in this connection, that the horrid practice of admitting women to the ranks of fighters prevailed in Ireland down to a long period after Patrick's day. A special law had to be enacted to put an end to it when its horrid brutality was denounced by some of the Irish clergy after a great battle between two rival clans proved that the gentle sex were no gentler in war, when the Celtic blood was up, than the other kind.

We would fain trust that the investigators who shall deal with the life of Columbanus will deal with this unpleasant aspect of the early conditions in a perfectly impartial way, leaving no prejudices to obscure the truth of history, and while nothing extenuating, settling down nought in malice. We know only too well what such "impartial" witnesses as Gerald Cambrensis, Camden, Edmund Spenser and other apologists of English cruelty and plunder have sought to do, and we have evidence that their efforts to prove that the English had a sort of Divine right to go into Ireland and visit the sin of its unruly inhabitants on its inoffensive people and reduce the ancient monarchy to a position of vassalage were not, and are not entirely fruitless even now. A great deal is made of the alleged Bull of the Pope giving the murderer of Saint Thomas a'Becket the commission to go to Ireland and reform the manners and customs of the inhabitants, then relapsing into a state of barbarism, as Cambrensis and Henry II. pretended. The genuineness of the alleged Bull of Adrian has been very carefully and, we opine, successfully, challenged, by one of the most eminent professors of history in Chicago University; while the evidence on which it was said to be based is so notoriously trumped up that we doubt if any reader can at this time of day accept it. The Pope is excused for sending the Normans over to Ireland to "reclaim it"—as they reclaimed Saxon England, as the boa constrictor "reclaims" the buffalo he has squeezed to death. Cardinal Newman is appealed to in support of these strange theories of justification for monstrous moral wrong, the Geryons and Minotaurs of fable, in the mediæval period. With all his power of reasoning and

persuasion the inimitable Cardinal could never succeed in convincing any people conquered by brute force as the Irish were—if indeed they can be truly said to be conquered at all—that the conquest was justified by the existence of abuses. There was no freedom from abuses in any country of Europe at the time that the Normans made their descent on Ireland.

One of the legends connected with the sweetest of Ireland's saints, Brigid, is that she was tainted in the circumstances of her birth. A very beautiful monograph of the saint who won and deserved the description of "the Mary of Ireland," written by the elegant essayist, Mrs. Sarah Atkinson, rejects this ugly slur on evidence, because "it contradicts the positive statements of the earliest writers and is discarded by the highest authorities, Protestant and Catholic (Usher, Ware, Dr. Lanigan and Canon O'Hanlon)." Yet, strange, very strange, to say it is accepted without demur by so respectable an historian as the Abbé MacGeoghegan. From the earliest period of Norman aggression the cunning methods of those brutal adventurers were the same in general plan as those relied on to-day by some Orangemen of Ulster to retain their wicked predominance in the government of Ireland by stirring up hatred among the different classes and ranks of society and holding up the majority, who are Catholics, to the hatred of the outside world as persecutors for religion's sake.

There are pointed illustrations of the stupid malice that pervaded, down to a few years ago, the histories of Catholic nations as penned by Protestant historians. Those who wished to slander the Church and the early Churchmen often enacted the part of Sir Giles Overreach in the old play. A common slur on the early Church was the pretense that it prohibited the Scriptures to the people and purposely and of malice aforethought kept the common herd in a state of the densest ignorance. There is in existence a very respectable goody-goody kind of history of France, patterned on the fashion of Charles Dickens' *Child's History of England*, as to bigotry and wholesale misrepresentation. It is called Markham's *History of France*, but Jacob Abbott fathers it and lets Mrs. Markham tell the tale in her own way. At the end of each chapter is a dialogue between the pupils and the instructor (or writer) in which the various facts narrated are taken up seriatim, and commented on by the whole party. Some of these comments are really gems of ingenuous freshness in bilious anti-Catholic statement. For example, the lady has just stated that Latin was the only language employed by writers in the early days of the Gallic monarchy; but one of her young hopefuls corrects her by reminding her that she forgot she had previously told them of an old book,

the *Saxon Chronicle*, that was written in that tongue. Then the good lady bethinks her of another book written in the same language—a translation of the Gospels, written in the year 376 by Ulphilas, one of the early Christians in Gothland. This was found, she adds, “hidden in the library of a monastery in Germany.” It was called “the silver book” from having some of the letters ornamented with silver. She may have deemed this a very ingenious way of concealing or disguising the fact that the monks of those early days employed their time and their learning in translating the Scriptures and the patristic works in order to carry on the work they were bidden to do—teaching the Gospel to all nations. They began it pretty early even in dark and remote Cimmerian snows, as the date of that particular “hidden” work shows. They executed it in secret and with holy diligence in a thousand cells all over Europe, in the nascent days of the Church, so that the Word of God should not perish from the earth; and the people who accuse the Church of having kept it from the people are obliged to prevaricate very clumsily when they desire to sustain the silly falsehood. Under the same author’s treatment the characters of Clovis and his immediate successors do not appear to much advantage—as, indeed, they ought not to. But the religion that Clovis embraced is sought to be held accountable for their offenses against it—as though the doctrine of free will and the facts of an ingrained barbarism in the Frankish savages had no bearing in such a history. The same line of preposterous criticism is carried out in all the chapters dealing with the slow emergence of France from the ruin wrought by the devastating hordes who overran its surface from the Cæsarean epoch down to that of Charles Martel. King Pepin, who donated the “patrimony of the Church,” is represented in a particularly repulsive light. There appears to be an entire absence of the sense of proportion in such critics and historians. No idea of the immensity of the task assigned to Christianity in the Divine dispensation seems to enter their contracted minds. No allowance is made for the almost universal spirit of militarism which permeated Europe in those ages of fierce struggle for power and the spirit of emulation which is the greatest factor in material progress. No; the Catholic Church has been a failure because it did not at one stroke change the whole current of human nature and transform myriads of sinners into saints. This book was published by the firm of Harper & Brothers in 1848, and must have had a large circulation because of the attractive style in which its poison was presented. It was written for the instruction of young people solely. The process of instilling calumny and distortion, as substitutes for the truth of history, began at a time most likely to

produce the effects which its designers hoped for. It was mainly by methods of malign wisdom, equally well calculated, that the propaganda of Islam was carried on in Europe until its blighting influence was felt all over its Eastern and Southern extent. To capture the youth of the Christian nations and train them up in the ideas and customs of the Moslems was for centuries the policy of the rulers at Constantinople, and it has only been too successful. A similar insidious process was for long put into practice by the English rulers of Ireland, in taking hostages from the leading houses, carrying them off to England, and holding them as securities for the loyalty of their parents, guardians and kindred. These in some cases learned at length to despise their own country, its manners and traditions, and became toadies and sycophants to their English patrons.

Ireland was not alone in being subjected to this particular form of martyrdom. Its tribulations were in large part of the very same sort that were visited upon the Welsh when Henry II., that murderous scourge of the Irish, set his heart upon the destruction of Welsh independence. Cambrensis, who wrote in a jaundiced way about what he found in Ireland when he went there to espy for Henry's advantage, took no small pains to show that, although his own countrymen, they were untamable barbarians. They were, as he wrote in his work on Wales, "so bold and ferocious that, when unarmed, they did not fear to encounter an armed force, being ready to shed their blood in defense of their country and to sacrifice their lives for renown; which is the more surprising, as the beasts of the field over the whole face of the island become gentle, but those desperate men could not be tamed. This bold calumny of Cambrensis did not pass unchallenged of lovers of the truth when it got publication. The French historian of the Norman Conquest remarked in regard to the calumny that "the Welsh nation was perhaps, in that age, of all others in Europe, that which least merited the designation of barbarians." Music and poetry are nature-tests of the difference between the humane and the savage. Both these qualities were possessed by the Irish Celts and the Cambrian ones. They both held many great assemblages of bards and poets at stated periods in the year, and the bard and the law-giver ranked next to royalty in their social constitution. Nothing of the kind was known among the Anglo-Saxons, or even the Anglo-Normans, who after some centuries developed some odd musical tastes in the shape of jongleur rhymes and jesters, ending in something more definite, the race of the peripatetic troubadours. The last of the Welsh kings, Griffith, ap Conan, was of Irish nativity and was a renowned patron of the liberal arts. He did more, the

chroniclers affirm, to promote the cultivation of music than any other of the Welsh monarchs. The genealogist, Yorke, on his work called *Royal Tribes of Wales*, says "he brought from Ireland, then the land of harps and harmony, our best tunes, better performers and a better order of instruments." The heroic but most tragic end of Griffith, it may be observed, is finely treated in Bulwer Lytton's *Harold, the Last of the Saxons*.

A widely-read New York publication some time ago created a sensation by giving space to a formal charge that representatives of the liquor interest deliberately lay themselves out to create an appetite for intoxicants in boys, and offering an affidavit as to the statement of one of the dealers in support of the charge. It is an odious charge, if true; but not more abhorrent than the plan adopted by writers of books for the young, in this country and in Great Britain, to poison the wells of history and offer the tainted water to the tender lips of youth, in the academies and colleges where the better classes had their children trained. The lessons thus imbibed, the writers fondly believed, would not only be indelible, but would be transmitted to succeeding generations. Those anticipations have been more than realized. Mrs. Markham's well-read book was not the only one that gave the impression that the descendants of Clovis were not only all wicked, but all physical decadents as well. A good many of them died at an early age, no doubt; but several of them, on the other hand, lived and reigned many years. Clothaire the First reigned for fifty years—nearly as good a record as that of the saint of British devotees like the authors of Abbott's book, Queen Elizabeth. Gontran, son of Clothaire, reigned thirty-two years. One of the race at least attained the highest canonical honors in the Church, St. Sigebert, son of Dagobert. Sigebert was educated by Pepin of Landen, founder of the family of Charlemagne and head of a race of saints. There were many other members of the Merovingian stock, men and women who devoted themselves to the service of God in religion; but this fact is of little moment in the minds of such Protestant historians, because religion meant in those ages the Catholic religion. But happily there have been other Protestant historians who formed a different conception of their responsibilities when they assumed the pen to trace the progress of civilization in the twilight period between the downfall of Paganism in Europe and the Renaissance—the span of time commonly referred to as "the dark ages," though the great stars who were to brighten the skies of time for future ages were, while these "dark" ones lasted, ascending to their respective pre-appointed heights of irradiating grace and glory. The Rev. S. Baring Gould, for instance, de-

scribing the reception of St. Fursey, the wonderful mystic who anticipated Dante in his spirit journeyings in the hidden world, tells how Sigebert, then King of Austrasia, went forth to meet and honor him when the saint was on the borders of his kingdom. The King dismounted from his horse, knelt to receive his blessing and conducted him, attended by his splendid cavalcade of warriors and courtiers, to his palace. He offered the saint magnificent presents; but these he declined. A small plot of ground on which to build a monastery he would only accept, and this was readily found.

"All the inhabitants, according to their means and opportunities, presented offerings to the servants of God for their immediate and future support. A church was also constructed, in a high style of art for the period, both internally and externally. To St. Fursey some gave village property, others offered woodlands, others again provided him with fish-abounding rivers, while from others he received flocks and herds, comprising different kinds of animals. Some grant him silk ornaments and materials, woven in various designs and wrought with gems and gold, others tender gold and silver vessels suitable for various offices of the Church; while some again assign their men and women serfs as heritages of the monastery; others resign themselves to the service of God, with all their possessions, having likewise assumed the religious habit."

Clovis II., brother of St. Sigebert, was King of Neustria, but was not distinguished for piety; yet he had a Queen who made up for any of his deficiencies in that way. Her name was Bathilde. She, after her husband's death, rebuilt the convent at Chelles, near Lagny, which St. Fursey had reared, on a piece of ground donated by her husband, and through reverence for St. Fursey, instituted there, after the fashion in Ireland, a double monastery for monks and nuns.

To understand the reason why those Irish saints who traversed Europe in those early days were so welcomed by rulers as well as ruled, it is well to recall with what enthusiasm the steam locomotive and the telegraph were hailed on their first introduction to the virgin soil of the American continent. Those Irish monks meant not only salvation of the soul wherever they went, but reclamation of the soil from the wilderness condition to which centuries of wars had reduced it. Where war had not devastated the face of the country, the virgin forest, never subdued by the woodsman's axe, covered immense tracts of land in Central Europe, stretching from the shores of the Baltic to the banks of the Danube. These gloomy regions not only prevented the sunlight from shedding its genial influence over the parts of the earth

they darkened, but gave shelter to hordes of savages who harassed the frontiers of the various States and robbed the traveling merchants as they went about their business from city to city and State to State. How much of the glory of rescuing the territory of Mid-Europe from that savage and dangerous condition belongs to the monks from Ireland can never be known. It can only be realized approximately by the processes of inference and the imagination. The American public can never gain the slightest knowledge on the subject if it be left to the pens of American and British writers of the partisan type to convey it.

In modern times, remarks Frederic Ozanam, it may seem an ordinary achievement to build churches and found religious houses. Not so, however, in the seventh century of the Christian era. To build a church in those days meant literally to plant the standard of Christ in a new territory, and to found a monastic settlement was to enlarge the frontiers of civilization. The abbeys of the seventh century, to quote a high authority, with their populations of three, four or five hundred monks, were so many fortresses, forming a barrier against the inroads of paganism. They were also securely-planted colonies, stationed in the midst of the fluctuating rural population. These religious societies were not subject to extinction by death, like the Bishops, nor could they abdicate their office. Neither were they capable of being led away in the retinue of kings. Consequently they were in a better position to oppose fraud and violence. Subject to obedience, leading chaste and laborious lives, these pious settlers astonished the barbarians, whom they attracted and retained by the benefits they conferred. In fact, they accomplished the first step toward civilization, fixing in a permanent abode the nomadic tribes. The abbeys were centres of science, sacred and secular, and at the same time schools of industry and agriculture. In their workshops all the arts of the antique world were taught, and from their cells went forth the men who opened up a way through the impenetrable forest with the indomitable perseverance of the ancient Romans.

One of the conditions for gaining the prize in tracing the life of St. Columbanus is that the historical background shall be presented in such manner as shall enable the task of St. Columbanus in his mission on the Continent of Europe to be duly appreciated and determined. The work will not be easy. If modern conditions in the United States can be not infelicitously described as a "melting pot," what must European society have been during the centuries which immediately succeeded the downfall of Paganism and the liberation of Christianity from the dark labyrinths of the Catacombs,

and when Goths and Huns and Vandals were thundering and firing all along the frontiers of the newly-liberated civilization?

The outward and visible proofs of the new power which the monks from Ireland brought into the service of mankind will not suffice in the presentation of the lives of any of its illustrious stars. The lives of saints, as presented to us in English literature, slur over the important part of such chronicles. The merest record of dry facts is presented. Little is shown to guide the reader as to the influences which concurred in bringing such aids to the work of God and the spread of civilization. Whence comes it that when anybody mentions "the lives of the saints" in ordinary conversation the remark is greeted with the shrug of the shoulders or the toss of the head that speaks more eloquently than words of the non-estimate in which such literature is held? In a very fine literary effort, *A Citizen Saint*, Mrs. Sarah Atkinson lays her finger on the weak spot in that department of our education. She has endeavored to point out how the fault may be corrected in laying down lines for an adequate life of St. Catherine of Siena.

"The order, the taste, the critical judgment required for writing the memoir of a soldier, a statesman, or an engineer; the skill expended as a matter of course on the biography of any one eminent in science or letters, appear to be disregarded when there is question of compiling the life of a saint. Edifying reading, no doubt, we have in these books. Sometimes we get a fair picture of the subject of the biography from one particular point of view taken or under the influence of a peculiar light. But seldom indeed is the life itself reproduced, with all its human interests as well as its supernatural adjuncts. The reader does not breathe the atmosphere in which those saintly fellow-creatures lived; does not see them in their daily life, meet the people they conversed with, hear what the townsfolk said of them. They are not individualized, and therefore are far less dear to us than the hero of a novel or a character on the stage. The life of a saint can no more be written by an uneducated pen, or by one careless of detail, than a portrait can be painted by an untrained, reckless hand. In fact, the saints we know best and love most have come down to us portrayed by the hand of genius itself—that is, by their own hand; or they had some loving, worshipful Boswell about them to gossip of their daily life, chronicle the little incidents that supply the essential, realistic cast, and preserve those precious personal traits that make the portrait lifelike. Thus we learn first to know and love the man, and then we understand the saint."

The great saints of the early Irish Church were fortunate in having each a Boswell, so to speak, to transmit to posterity the

record of his spiritual career—some more than one. Their faithful brethren loved to memorize their notable maxims and dwell on the beauties of their thoughts as they expatiated on the Divine attributes and the glories of the heaven which God ever held before their mind's eyes as an incentive to the highest reachings of their souls in the winning of more souls for Him. Patrick and Columba were especially fortunate in this regard. Irish hagiology in fact abounds with proofs of the keen interest with which the disciples everywhere hung upon the words of the beloved teachers and the fidelity with which they transmitted the record of their spiritual triumphs and the material fruits of their labors in the vineyard, in the erection of abbeys, churches, shrines and schools, as they moved along their appointed paths. The Four Masters noted everything, besides, in a general way. Those who went abroad to labor among the Franks and Germans, as Columbanus and Boniface and Gall, were not quite so fortunate. Yet there are enough materials to be found by the diligent searcher, in the libraries of Bobbio and St. Gall and others to furnish a satisfactory biography of Columbanus. The saint's own literary remains form a respectable library in themselves.

The personal character of Columbanus was preëminently Celtic, it would appear. He was, like Columba, high-strung and quick-tempered, a man with the courage and daring of an eagle and the tenderness of a dove. His love for God and the Blessed Virgin was truly Irish in its passionate depth and steadfastness. In his dealings with the fierce and haughty sensualists, Brunehault and Theodoric, he showed all the stern holiness of John the Baptist toward Herod and his wicked family. There will be no lack of spirit-stirring material in the chronicle. The scene amidst which the picture will be framed is wild and thrilling enough for the canvas of a Salvator Rosa or a Turner, yet the sober eyes of an historical student will regard them without excitement and only in the light of illustrations of the obstacles which Christianity had to wrestle with and conquer ere the ground was cleared in Europe for the triumph of the Cross. We believe that if a satisfactory work on Columbanus be the outcome of the contest, both as to historical worth and literary excellence consonant with the dignity of the theme, the guerdon offered will not be out of proportion to the service rendered the Church and the onerous character of the labor of research and verification its conscientious performance entailed. We might also venture the hope that some other lover of literature might provide a solatium for the losers in the competition, that the gall of Brennus may not be added to the pain of loss—the cruel words, “woe to the losers.”

Philadelphia.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Book Reviews

THE PRICE OF UNITY. By B. W. Maturin. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. Pp. xxxi.+283. Price, 5 shillings.

This is an interesting and even a pathetic book, as well as a contribution to apologetic literature likely to produce good fruit, for Father Maturin gives us here what is evidently, to some extent, an *Apologia pro vita sua*. The personal note is sounding all through and awakens our sympathy. "The Price of Unity," for the writer of this work, as for many others—what was it? The leaving of home, of kith and kin, of friends, to enter, it is true, the Promised Land, yet at what a sacrifice, with what relinquishment of cherished ideals and plans, with what tearing up by the roots of old and dear associations! We are reminded in this account which Father Maturin gives of his leaving Anglicanism for the true Church of the "dying bed" of Newman as an Anglican. Father Maturin cannot understand, any more than Newman would have understood, the vulgar attitude of those who, as soon as they become Catholics, "speak with bitterness, still less with ridicule, of that which had once been their religious home. One of the Fathers speaks somewhere of Christianity giving a decent burial to Judaism. It was not to be huddled into the ground and heaped over with ridicule and contempt (pages 6 and 7). The parallel is hardly a just one as between Anglicanism and Catholicity, yet we cannot but sympathize with the author in deprecating the attitude of some converts who "speak with contempt and ridicule of their past beliefs and minimize or deny all the good that was in them and all that God had done for their souls. The moment they entered the Catholic Church was the beginning of their spiritual life; nothing that went before counts for anything. I am not, of course, speaking of those who really had no religious experience before, but of those who were religious and faithful according to their lights. They imagine that they have experienced a kind of religious revolution and passed from a state of things that was utterly corrupt and rotten to one that is full of light and peace. They will make merry over their efforts at what was good, and talk of what they once revered, and what at the time was to them intensely real, as ridiculous and absurd. Any approaches to truth that they experienced were simply caricatures, diabolical efforts to mislead. . . . I have met not a few converts to the Catholic Church who seem to think that all this kind of talk proves to the world what good

Catholics they are and helps to commend them as such to those whose lot has placed them in the Church from the first. They out-catholic Catholics, they run riot in their new home. . . . Such an attitude is, to say the least of it, utterly wanting not only in good taste, but in humility and sincerity, which are always the conditions of any real spiritual life, and I am sure fails in commending these people to those whose approval they desire." (Pages 4 and 6.)

And in the following passage we have one of those personal notes of which the book is full and which could not have been written but by one who had felt it all: "If the very serious crisis through which he has passed has meant to him all that it ought to mean, he must feel raw, wounded, bleeding at every pore. The wrench from old friends and associations, from the old round of his religious ways which had woven itself into his life and gone deep into his soul must surely leave him for a time crushed and humbled. The very feeling of being under the strong hand of God, who has given him grace to see and to do what is utterly beyond his own strength; the sense of the need of time, of prayer, of solitude, of deep thought, before he can focus his eyes to see things in their new relations and proportions, cries aloud to him to withdraw and be alone with God, and get as far as he can from the strife of tongues and the clash of controversy through which he had to pass to reach his haven of peace. Surely it is not the moment for a man grasping (sic—this must be a misprint for 'gasping') in the agonies of death to what he has broken from, and of new birth into a religious world upon which he has but just entered, to begin at once to show up the inconsistencies and anomalies of a system which he has only just left, and to sing the glories of that upon which he has, by the mercy of God, been allowed to enter, as the newest and youngest, and he must feel the most unworthy member. Such a light and airy way of meeting the most serious moment of his life does not beget confidence in the public mind, and betokens neither seriousness, sound judgment nor good taste."

The author pleads for "conservatism" under such circumstances; the recognition that the old Truth held before is still true, that God is to be thanked that there was so much of the Truth, and that while "all that cannot be reconciled with the new Truth must go," it should go, "so to speak, of itself—it is pushed quietly aside without much of a jerk or a jar, in the splendid synthesis by which all gathers around the new, central, all-combining truth and discloses its place and meaning." (Page 12.) There follows an able analysis of the process by which the old Truth—the Truth that was held "in all good conscience in a system that was only partially

true," and held with a mixture of certain traditional beliefs that were not true, destroys in a man's mind all that was untrue, and "fulfills and unfolds to its utmost capacities the more or less crude conceptions of truth that he already held." As an instance of this, take the following: "There is scarcely a doctrine of the Catholic Church, except the Papacy, which a modern advanced High Churchman does not already believe, so that in the mere matter of dogma he finds little difference. Yet there is a very decided difference in the way in which the doctrine is held. Of course, a High Churchman will say that he holds all that he believes in the authority of the Church. But the authority of a vague and shadowy Church of antiquity is a very different thing from a living, definite Church which speaks and commands here and now, and whose authority you feel acting upon you, disciplining you and keeping you in order. There is a sense of discipline, including all from the head to the lowliest members, that you feel as a living force. You are conscious of living in a body that is held together, not merely by the devotion and enthusiasm of its members, but by something objective, something stronger than the individual earnestness of any or all of its members. You are conscious not that you are helping the Church, but that it is helping you. You feel in one sense as you never felt before, of how very little importance you are. You are but a very humble and lowly member of a vast, world-wide kingdom, that has its own laws, and institutions, and traditions and ways of dealing with people, and that has been going on for ages. You came to it not primarily to give, but to receive, etc." (Page 17.)

Most pathetically is described the struggle to be gone through by one whose religious convictions in Anglicanism were deep and strong, and who gradually finds out that he had been loving an ideal which is not to be found in that religious body to which, believing it to be part of Christ's Church, he had heart and soul devoted himself and given the best energies of more than half a lifetime. "The shock is and must necessarily be tremendous, especially to any one to whom his religion had been a reality. Yet it need not make a wreck. It need not create cracks and fissures in the structure of the soul, which are afterwards hard to mend. Still less should there be anything like a jolting out of the old furniture and then an impossible effort to refurnish the soul anew. And so, to apply this to the work of Apologetics, "there is no need for a Catholic to exhibit any niggardliness in recognizing to the full and rejoicing in every grain of Truth he can find in any other system, however imperfect or corrupt. By laying hold of these truths we claim a point of contact and sympathy for ourselves,

and we find amidst the wood, hay, stubble, gold, silver and precious stones that lie about some solid basis upon which to build. Show a man how much he holds in common with Catholics; how much he must continue always to hold if he becomes a Catholic; how much more, in believing what he does, he implicitly believes, even though he does not know it, the reasonable and logical consequences that ought to follow, if he *will* be reasonable, and you begin from within rather than from without. You do not begin by ridiculing the absurdities of his position—principles accepted with their obvious conclusions denied—or by exposing the narrow and stifling atmosphere which he breathes, hemmed in by the high walls of prejudice; you put into his hands the tools with which he breaks down the walls and opens the unfinished roads for himself. You show him, believing as he does how much more he ought to believe, and you point him to that great objective vision of the perfect building, complete and developed in all its parts, the length, breadth and height of which are equal, where his crude and half-finished thoughts are pushed forward fearlessly to their issue, with much more added that falls in and takes its place, for its adornment and completion. Faith, imperfect and timid, it may be, begins the work, reason develops it, and perfect faith completes it." The rest of Father Maturin's book, that is, from Chapter II. onward, is an excellent piece of apologetic conducted on these sympathetic lines. Those who are inclined to despise the advanced movement in the Anglican body will find good reasons for modifying their opinion. Yet Father Maturin is quite free from any suspicion of unlawful concessions in matters of principle, and, with all his great sympathy for persons, and his belief that the "Catholic" movement is the work of the Holy Spirit in *individual hearts and minds*, he is himself far too clear-minded not to be aware of the utter failure of the movement as a system to clear itself of its fatal connection with pure Protestantism. Kindly and gently, yet most keenly and thoroughly, he pierces through the fatal delusion that Anglicanism is Catholicity or ever can be. For priests who have to deal with Anglicans this book contains many a useful direction how to proceed; and we believe that great good will be done to any sincere Anglican who can be got to read it.

THE RATISBON "IDEAL BREVIARY." In four volumes, 8vo. French morocco, net, \$14.00; Turkey morocco, net, \$15.00; Russian leather, net, \$18.50. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This is the first complete Breviary that has come from the press since the new arrangement was made. Its early appearance is surprising until one learns that the publishers were preparing a

new edition of this size and had almost completed it when the changes were announced. With their usual promptness, they immediately discarded a large part of the printed sheets and substituted the new Psalter and Ordinary, at the same time making many other necessary changes. The result is the first complete Breviary in strict conformity with the newly prescribed rubrics.

It is called "Ideal" because of its compact size, its clear, legible print and because it has practically no references. This last feature is most desirable and most complete. It might be said that the book is Ideal also because it is suitable for use either at home or abroad, and because it is as small as it is possible to make the new Breviary for practical purposes. It is about the size of the larger votive office book in length, breadth and thickness, and therefore is thin enough to be carried in the coat pocket. The publishers remind us that as the book is imported from Europe and there is a great demand for it, early orders are necessary to ensure delivery before the new law becomes binding. They also warn us not to wait for other editions, larger or smaller, because a year at least is required in the making of a new edition, and the cost is so great that they are not prepared to announce any other edition now. Finally, for the benefit of the timorous, they quote Mgr. Piacenza, one of the leading members of the Commission for the Reform of the Breviary, who says: "Many years must pass before a complete reform of the Breviary will be accomplished."

THE STORY OF CECILIA. By *Katharine Tynan Hinkson*. 12mo., \$1.25.

THE WARGRAVE TRUST. By *Christian Reid*. 12mo., \$1.25.

AGATHA'S HARD SAYING. By *Rosa Mulholland*. 12mo., \$1.25.

THE TEMPEST OF THE HEART. By *Mary Agatha Gray*. 12mo., \$1.25.

This group of Catholic novels furnishes a striking illustration of the very commendable zeal of Benziger Brothers for the spread of good Catholic literature, and at the same time the excellence of the books gives the best proof that their zeal is wise. It seems only a short time since reviewers of Catholic stories generally began with an apology for the literary weakness of the book and begged the reader to accept it for its Catholicity. But that time is passed. The most exacting reviewer of this group of novels may commend them first for their literary value and then for their Catholicity, for they are not written to teach religion, and yet they teach it in the most effectual way by showing us how men and women who have the true faith act when confronted with the problems of life. Other things being equal, the Catholic novel ought to be the best, because while it may have all the interest of the best secular novel, it benefits the reader by holding up

before him the highest ideals and furnishes him with the correct answer to life's riddles. Catholics have bodies and souls like other men; they have the same tendencies, the same temptations; they occupy the same stations of life, and have figured in the history of the world since the time of Christ, side by side with their brothers of other faiths and no faith. Why should not their lives furnish as many and as interesting episodes and adventures as the lives of others. They do, and therefore the Catholic novel can be made just as interesting as the best secular novel. The great difference between them is this, that almost invariably at the present day the secular novel approves of conjugal infidelity or connives at it, introduces the divorce court to furnish legal justification of it and removes troublesome actors in the drama by the homicidal or suicidal weapon. The Catholic novel, on the contrary, teaches that marriage is God's holy institution and Christ's holy sacrament; that unfaithfulness is a horrible sin in itself, against the marital partner and against the community; that the marriage bond is the most solemn and most binding of all contracts between men, and that the words "for better or worse, richer or poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part," are not an empty form; that the remedy for family troubles is prayer, patience, good example and the carrying of the cross even unto death, if needs be, but never to the murderer's or suicide's grave.

The *Story of Cecilia* hinges on the breaking of an engagement by the supposed death of the man, the weakening of the woman's mind by the shock, his return after many years to meet the daughter of his betrothed and seek her hand in marriage, because her mother in the meantime had married some one else. The story, in its main incident, resembles closely a play produced by the Kendals with great success, called the *Weaker Sex*.

Critics agree that this is Katharine Tynan's best story. It has all the excellencies of her previous novels, and in addition it has that artistic finish which is due partly to the artistic inborn instinct, but also to experience, practical and mature judgment.

In the *Wargrave Trust* we have Christian Reid at her best. A declaration of this kind is not to be taken absolutely, because the question of best is subjective to a great extent. Tastes differ as to plots, but this Southern tale of high ideals and chivalry, made interesting by just enough doubt and uncertainty as to hold the interest of the reader until the end, is very charming.

Agatha's Hard Saying takes its author into a difficult field, and it required a great deal of courage. The manner in which the gifted author handles the theme fully justifies her venture. It deals with a lady who has secretly become the slave of intoxicants,

and whose husband, before he dies, makes his daughter Agatha promise not to marry and to use her influence over her sisters to the same end, lest the dreadful curse should be handed down to future generations.

A popular author in this country recently used a similar plot, and the contrast between the treatment of it by the Catholic and the non-Catholic author illustrates what has been said about the difference between the Catholic and the secular novel.

In *The Tempest of the Heart* we have another illustration of the same kind. It is the story of a young monk who has just finished his novitiate, but before making his final vows he leaves his monastery and goes into the world to give full play to his magnificent musical gifts. He is saved by the prayers of his devoted sister, and realizing that all his gifts are from God and can be used most perfectly in his service, returns to his monastery and corresponds with the vocation which God has given him. Is it possible to imagine any popular non-Catholic author of the present day ending this story in this way? Can we not recall without effort several popular stories of recent date and of similar plot ending in a directly opposite manner? Almost invariably when the monk or nun is tempted in the secular novel, he or she falls, whereas in true stories almost invariably they resist the temptation and are faithful. The Catholic novel therefore is not only as interesting as the secular novel, not only as literary, but it is far more instructive, more edifying and truer to nature.

CHRIST'S TEACHING CONCERNING DIVORCE. An Exegetical Study. By Rev. Francis E. Gogot, D. D., Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y. 8vo., cloth, net, \$1.50. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The present exegetical study was undertaken with the intimate conviction that a thorough investigation of the earliest documents of Christianity would supply a clear vindication of the indissoluble nature of Christian marriage as distinctly maintained by the living tradition of the Roman Catholic Church and solemnly proclaimed by the Council of Trent.

With this in view the author has examined the various passages of the sacred books of the New Testament which set forth Christ's teaching regarding divorce. He has pursued his study of these passages on strictly scientific lines, using every means at his disposal to ascertain the exact meaning of our Lord's words concerning the sacred character and binding force of the marriage tie.

The undoubted result of his inquiry is to the effect that Christ's law condemns an adulterous remarriage after separation of husband and wife who have consummated their valid conjugal union.

Some chapters of the book have already appeared in the *New York Review*, and are here reproduced with only such modification as was necessary to adapt them to the rest of the book. An important feature of the volume is an Introductory Chapter, in which is given a summary of the whole book. This enables one to get a grasp of the question at a glance. A copy of the Jewish bill of divorce and a complete bibliography add very much to the volume of the work.

The reader hardly needs any assurance that Dr. Gigot handles the subject well. It would be presumptuous to praise a work of this kind from the pen of a scholar of such standing. It may not be amiss, however, to call attention to the timeliness of the book. Divorce has multiplied so rapidly, has become so widespread, so fashionable, so respectable (?), that the arguments in favor of it convince almost the elect, if that were possible. At such a time every one should be well armed. This book furnishes the most powerful, the most effective weapon.

THROUGH THE DESERT. A Romance of the Time of the Mahdi. By *Henryk Stenkwicz*, author of "Quo Vadis," "With Fire and Sword," "Pan Michael," etc. With ten full-page illustrations by P. Schwormstadt. 12mo., cloth, net, \$1.35. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A splendid story in every respect. The author chooses for his hero and heroine two children, a boy of fourteen and a girl of eight. They are stolen from their parents in Northern Africa by the natives for political reasons, and their adventures in the Desert, until they are rescued, after long wanderings, through many dangers and with wonderful experiences, make a fascinating story.

It is clean, it is possible, it is true to nature, being entirely correct in geography and natural history. The manner in which the author introduces the different tribes of Africa, with their customs and superstitions, is very skillful, and the animals of the Desert are really made to live in the pages of the book. Although the story is especially interesting for children and very profitable, too, it is by no means a child's story.

It is not very long since the literary world was startled by the appearance of a story of the African Desert, which has since been dramatized and produced at enormous expense. And yet in that book the hero is a Trappist Monk who leaves his monastery, denies his faith, and attempts to marry a young woman, who does not know his previous history. After living together for some time, she learns his identity, and forces him to return to his monastery, which he reenters protesting his undying love for her. Another one of the characters is an educated Catholic gentleman who be-

comes a Mahommedan. Contrast his action with that of the boy of fourteen openly professing his faith in the presence of the Mahdi.

And yet the story of the African Desert by the non-Catholic author, will probably have thousands of readers, while the more interesting, more edifying, truer and cleaner story will have only hundreds.

BACK TO THE WORLD. A new novel by *Champol*. Translated by L. M. Leggatt, with frontispiece of the author. 12mo., cloth, net, \$1.35. Postage 15 cents extra. New York: Benziger Brothers.

As a psychological study, "Back to the World" is a powerful and moving tale of more than ordinary interest and significance. But as a narrative of conditions which obtain at the present day in France the author has outdone himself in his keen and sympathetic treatment of a subject which has become a momentous problem no less than a lamentable condition.

The graphic picture of the poor nuns driven forth from the quiet peace of cloistered walls into the brutal daylight of a jeering and unsympathetic world, is no more ably presented than the stirring recital of their experiences in a world to which they were as alien as the spirit of Christ Himself.

The character of Henriette is a masterpiece of drawing. Although her erstwhile remaining companions, Sister St. Louis and Mother St. Helene, pass through a fiery ordeal of bodily suffering whose end is the blessedness of a holy death, Henriette, the quondam Sister St. Gabriel, is tried in the furnace of a more subtle fire—the influence of a reawakened love—the importunities of a worldly, though devoted mother, and all the insidious temptations of an environment, the luxury of which is sapping at her spiritual strength, and almost stilling in her heart the faint and fainter echoes of her cloistered past. It must be noted, however, that the nun is not tempted to sin. She has been released from her vows, she is free to marry, her mother urges her to honorable marriage, and the conflict is between the good and the perfect.

ROUND THE WORLD. A Series of Interesting Articles on a Great Variety of Subjects. Vols. IX. and X. 12mo., pp. 222 each. General index. Profusely illustrated. \$1.00 a volume. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The essays or descriptive articles in these volumes, and the same may be said of all the other volumes of the series, might be called moving pictures in print. They are so interesting, so well written, so becomingly illustrated and so varied that they remind one of the best class of moving-picture entertainment, in which the spectator is introduced to foreign cities, to the beauties and wonders of nature in various parts of the world, to great industries and to

scenes from history. The "Round the World" series presents an entertainment much like this: In Volume IX. we find "Training a Nation's Soldiers," "Talk-Lore of the Chinese," the "Madeira Islands," "Niagara in Winter," the "Smallest Profession in the World" and other interesting subjects. In Volume X. we have "In the Cotton Field," "Talk-Lore of the Land of the Fleur-de-lys," "New Year's Customs," "Poisonous Snakes," "World's Great Water Courses" and others equally attractive. The pictures are exceptionally good, and a better book of its kind for the home library, where young minds are being trained and taught, could not be found.

THE FRIENDSHIP OF CHRIST. By *Robert Hugh Benson*. 12mo., pp. 187. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"The following pages contain in an abbreviated form sermons preached in Rome in the Church of St. Silvestro-in-Capite, during the year 1911. Some of them were also preached in the Carmelite Church in Kensington in 1910." They all treat of the friendship of Christ for man, and consider the various ways in which this friendship is shown. The book contains thirteen sermons altogether, which are divided into three parts: Christ in the Interior Soul, Christ in the Exterior and Christ in His Historical Life.

The first part contains two sermons on the Purgative Way and the Illuminative Way, in addition to two on the Friendship of Christ. The third part has two sermons on Christ our Friend Crucified and Christ our Friend Vindicated. The second part has seven sermons on Christ in the Eucharist, in the Church, in the Priest, in the Saint, in the Sinner, in the Average Man and in the Sufferer.

Monsignor Benson's sermons are rather cast in essay form, and lend themselves well to publication. It is true of some preachers that their sermons must be heard to be appreciated. Monsignor Benson is an exception, as was Cardinal Newman.

Their sermons have a literary form and value which give them a charm and a power outside of the pulpit. They may be taken in by the eyes as well as by the ears, and therefore they have a lasting value as well.

The sermons in this book have this quality and they are worth while.

WHEN "TODDLES" WAS SEVEN. By *Mrs. Hermann Bosch*. With frontispiece. Crown, 8vo., \$1.00 net.
BIBLE STORIES TOLD TO "TODDLES." By the same. Crown, 8vo., \$0.80, net.
 New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

In these books the almost impossible task is accomplished of teaching serious lessons to small children in an interesting and

instructive manner. "Toddles" is an inquiring child of seven years, and its mother is the teacher. From the everyday happenings of a child's life the teacher takes occasion to give direction by drawing on the parables and on the Passion of Christ. To be able to do this successfully is almost an impossible task, but here it is done.

In the second volume the teacher sets before "Toddles" in the same skillful, interesting and comprehensive manner stories from the New Testament, dealing principally with the life of Christ, beginning with the Nativity. To these very interesting chapters have been added on *Toddles in the Presence of God* and *Why Toddles Should Not Be Afraid*. Many children between seven and ten can read these books without any help; but they will be most effectual in the hands of parents or other teachers.

PSALTERIUM ROMANUM Breviarii Romani cum Ordinario Divini Officii iussu SS. D. N. PII PP. X. Novo Ordine Per Hebdomadam Dispositum et Editum. 48mo., 3x5 inches in cloth, \$0.40; 48mo., 3x5 inches in mor., \$0.85; 18mo., 4x6 inches in cloth, \$0.50; 18mo., 4x6 inches in mor., \$1.15. New York: Frederick Pustet & Co.

The new Psalter is appearing in new form every day, and even the most exacting demands may be satisfied. It is not surprising to find Pustet & Co. in the field early. The attractive and trustworthy breviaries which they have always published moved the clergy to look to them for the best in psalters. Nor were they disappointed. In the two editions before us we have all that could be desired in this respect. They are exact reproductions of the Vatican Version, with all the careful attention to detail in paper, printing and binding that has made the Ratisbon breviaries so distinctive. These editions are so compactly made that they can be easily attached to the breviary and carried with it.

The publishers ask for prompt orders, because the supply is limited and because it will not be renewed after new editions of the breviary are published with the psalter bound in.

CHRISTUS. Manuel d'Histoire des Religions. Par Joseph Huby. 12mo., pp. 1,036. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie.

We have here a history of the religions of the nations of the world, with a history of Christianity at the various periods of its existence. The different chapters are by different authors, and most of them have already appeared in the English Catholic Truth Society publications.

Each chapter is opened by a clear summary of its contents and closed by an excellent bibliography. They form a collection of treatises chosen because of their individual worth, and they form a combination that is most commendable.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII.—OCTOBER, 1912—No. 148.

SERVIA AND THE BALKAN CRISIS.

THE outbreak of hostilities in Montenegro on the 8th of October may have momentous results not only for the Balkan Peninsula, but for all Europe, if not in the immediate present, certainly in the nearing future. It means the reopening of that still unsolved *quæstio vexata* of European diplomacy, the Eastern Question, which has long baffled the skill of the ablest statesmen and obsessed the Cabinets of St. Petersburg, Vienna and London like a troublesome spirit. The daring dash for freedom which the brave mountaineers of the little Balkan State made when they boldly threw down the gage of battle and let loose the dogs of war against Turkey was like setting a match to a mine which threatened to blow up the foundations of an empire that has lasted since the Cross went down before the Crescent and Constantinople was captured by the Mahommedans. For the first time in their checkered history the restless races who inhabit the Peninsula were united in a league against the tyrannical power that too long has been allowed to oppress them. With Turkey at war with Italy, a unique opportunity presented itself of striking, with one accord, a big blow for liberty and avenging the wrongs of centuries. Servians and Bulgars, though heretofore hereditary enemies, were united in view of such a crisis which appealed to the patriotism and cherished dreams and ambitions of Slavs and Greeks. The "Sick Man," if not on his deathbed, was, to all seeming, in very enfeebled health, and the psychological moment for giving him his *coup de grace* appeared to have come. Under

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912, by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

these circumstances it was hard for the plucky peoples of the Balkans, who had so long sorrowed and suffered under the iron despotism of the Porte, to be held in leash by the great powers and warned that, even if successful, after setting their lives upon the cast, prepared to stand the hazard of the die, no change in the existing *status quo* and no accession of territory would be permitted. The Balkan States were to pull the chestnuts out of the fire, but the biggest chestnut of all—Constantinople—was a prize to be reserved for one or other of the great powers which had never run any of the risks of war, never drawn a sword or fired a shot. The end is not yet, but it cannot be very far off, as a glance at the map indicates clearly how the Turk, once the terror of Europe, is being gradually squeezed out of a continent his presence pollutes.

In any adjustment of the balance of power in Southern Europe, Serbia is bound to play a prominent part. It has been called the Key of the Balkans. Its history contains many blood-stained pages from the beginning down to the revolting regicide which preceded the advent of King Peter to the insecure throne upon which he is seated by favor of a military revolt, a revolution of the palace, that shocked Europe by its atrocity and by a deed that recalled the darkest of the dark ages.

It was in the sixth and seventh centuries that the Roman Province of Mœsia was first invaded by Servian bands from beyond the Carpathians. Midway in the ninth century, when they had become Christianized, they had their first armed conflict with their hereditary rivals, the Bulgarians—primitively a Tartan tribe speaking a Slavonic dialect—when Tsar Simeon ravaged the country, and, for a time, effaced it as a national entity. Then the Byzantine Emperor swooped down upon Bulgaria and Serbia and annexed both. In the eleventh century we find the Servians engaged in a guerrilla war in Montenegro. In the twelfth century Serbia began to make history as an organized kingdom, ruled by Stefan Nemanya, who annexed Bosnia in 1169; who was compelled to crawl before the Byzantine Emperor, barefooted and with a halter round his neck, proclaimed his independence in 1185, married his son to a daughter of the Emperor, and in 1195 abdicated and retired to a monastery. His eldest son, Stefan, "the first crowned," was recognized by the Emperor Baldwin as "by the grace of God, King of all Servian lands even to the seacoast." On June 28, 1330, Stefan Urosh broke up the Bulgarian Empire at the battle of Velbuzhd. His son Stefan, surnamed Dushan (Darling), one of the country's historic heroes, in 1340 extended his sway over the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, and was known by the high-sounding title of "Emperor

of the Romans, Tsar of Macedonia, loving the Christ." This territorial expansion so alarmed the Byzantine Emperor that he formed an offensive alliance with the Ottomans. On Michaelmas Day, 1356, Stefan marched on Constantinople with a force of eighty thousand men; but on the 18th of December, when the vanguard of his army was actually at the gates of the capital, he died.

From this epoch dates the decadence of the old Servian Empire which fell, never to rise, at the famous battle of Kosovo (June 15, 1389)—"the field of the blackbirds," where Lazar, the last Servian Tsar, the hero of innumerable patriotic legends and ballad poetry, made a last stand and perished¹ along with his nine brothers-in-law and the élite of the Servian aristocracy. Black crows, it is said, brought the news of his defeat and the downfall of his Empire to the Tsarina Militsa as she sat watching in her tower at Krushevats, hoping for the triumphal return of her liege lord. This battle is still the theme of every Servian hymn, and Montenegrins still wear black bands on their caps in mourning for the defeat. The victor, the Sultan Murad, was slain in his tent after the battle by Milosch Obilitch, Lazar's son-in-law, who is to this day popularly regarded as a patriotic hero, for he was hewn to pieces by the Sultan's guards. Murad's tomb is still to be seen at Kossovo.

For seventy years their Turkish conquerors permitted Servian chiefs to exercise nominal power. In 1440 Servia was governed by a Pasha. John Hunyad, called "the white Knight of Wallachia" on account of his silvery armor, struck the last blow for independence, and the treaty of Szegedin in 1444 secured the evacuation of Servia by the Turks. But it was only for a time, for in 1463 all Servians had either submitted to the Ottomans or emigrated to Hungary. It was destined to long remain in subjection to the Porte.

"A sketch of Servian history during the Turkish dominion," says a recent writer,² "would be strangely incomplete without a reference to Marko Kraljevich, who is the Slav Cid or King Arthur, the hero of innumerable legends which vividly portray the national ideals. Kraljevich means 'king's son,' the King in question being Vukashin, who supplanted Urosh, son of Dushan. Marko protested against this act of disloyalty, whereupon Vukashin cursed him, praying that he might have neither tomb nor posterity and might be doomed to serve the 'Tsar of the Turks.' But Urosh blessed him and prayed that he might know no equal in wisdom and

¹ The Turkish Sultan with his dying breath ordered his execution after he had been taken prisoner.

² "The Servian Tragedy," by Herbert Vivian, M. A.

prowess and that his name might everywhere he celebrated as long as sun and moon should endure. 'Thus they spake, and thus it came to pass,' is the commentary of an old Servian 'pesma (ballad). Marko fought in the Sultan's armies, but the Sultan feared him, 'for the wrath of Marko was terrible,' and though the peerless knight has no known sepulchre, he lived, if legends may be trusted, for three hundred years; he still lives in the heart of every patriotic Servian, and there are many who believe that he will awake one day from his long sleep and come forth to restore the glories of the ancient empire. Every year, on the anniversary of his slava (the Servian family festival) he may still be seen near a little chapel in the vilayet of Kosovo, careering the forests on his faithful skewbald charger Sharato, who bore him through all his famous campaigns. It is significant of Servia's attitude towards the Turks that Marko should remain her prominent hero, despite his prowess in the service of the Sultan. Turkish suzerainty was regarded as the lesser of two evils, and, in accepting it, Marko was merely an exponent of the spirit of his age. Moreover, the haze of legend has transfigured him, and it is impossible to criticize too closely the political morality of one who slew dragons and vampires, became blood-brother to a vila or wood-nymph, and may almost be numbered among the hajdutsi (outlaws)."

Towards the close of the eighteenth century an Austrian army overran Servia. In 1804 the Turkish Janissaries killed the Pasha of Servia and massacred nearly every leading Servian. One of the few who escaped to the mountains was George Petrovich, known to history as Kara or Black George, whose grandson is the reigning sovereign of Servia. He was a singular character, half hero, half brigand, at once chivalrous and sanguinary, as brave, as brutal and as bizarre as any mediæval marauding baron or free lance. Originally a peasant, an obscure Shumadian neat-herd from the midst of the forests, he joined the Austrian raiders. Outlawed until peace was restored, he became a pig-breeder and drove a lucrative trade with the Austrians on the frontier, until the Janissaries sought to kill him. Gathering round him a band of hardy mountaineers, he organized the country, arming his followers with scythes and pitchforks, and as commander of the Servians, their supreme chief, engaged the Janissaries in a pitched battle and defeated them; captured the fortress of Shabato; invested Belgrade, and, aided by the Pasha of Bosnia, compelled the rebellious Janissaries to submit. Thanked by the Sultan for their loyalty to the Porte and requested to return to their farms, they refused to lay down their arms until given guarantees against the recurrence of massacres. A mission was sent to Constantinople

to propose conditions. The Sultan's reply was to throw all the delegates into prison and send the Pasha of Nish against the armed peasants, to meet with unexpected resistance from Kara George and his ten thousand followers. The affrighted Pasha fled and shortly after died of sheer shame.

Kara George, now master of all the interior of Servia, was able to capture Semendria before the Turks renewed hostilities. When thirty thousand Bosnians crossed the River Kolubara, the Servians disbanded. With the simultaneous appearance of forty thousand Turks on the eastern frontier, it seemed all up with the Servians. But Kara George was not dismayed. A master of guerrilla tactics, with fifteen hundred men he opposed the advance of the Bosnians, who were being shot down by invisible foes, when they concentrated their forces under the walls of Shabato and forced a battle in the neighboring plain of Mishar (August 4, 1806). "Kara George," relates the writer already quoted,³ "seemed almost superhuman. His colossal figure towered above his comrades, his voice thundered like a hurricane, the sight of his prodigious valor nerved the most timorous. His victory was complete, only a few scattered fugitives being able to escape across the frontier. Meanwhile the Turks in Eastern Servia were being harassed by the usual guerrilla warfare, and when Kara George arrived upon the scene with his triumphant troops, the Pasha offered terms of peace. In October, 1806, the Porte was ready to concede self-government to the Servians, provided her suzerainty were acknowledged and a tribute paid. When, however, the time came to ratify the arrangement, Russia was on the eve of war with Bonaparte, and the Sultan was encouraged to recall his offer. Kara George resolved to continue the war, and on the 13th of December, 1806, he captured Belgrade. Hideous scenes of massacre ensued. The garrison was cut to pieces, despite promises of safe conduct. . . . By the end of 1807 a settled Servian Government had been called into existence. A Senate and a Skupohtina were appointed. But Kara George had a short way with representative bodies which resisted his will. His soldiers received orders to point their muskets through the windows of the Parliament House, and the legislators soon saw the wisdom of reconsidering hasty decisions. In the spring of 1809 he conceived the idea of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. He had established his headquarters at Novi-Bazar when he received intelligence of a disaster on the eastern frontier of Servia. One leader refused to succor another in the hour of need; the commander at Nish exploded a powder magazine and sacrificed the whole garrison rather than fall into the hands of the Turks, and

³ "The Servian Tragedy," Introduction, pp. 7-9.

the victors erected a tower composed of the skulls of their victims. Kara George hastened across Servia with incredible speed, only to find the Servians in a panic. Such was his fury that he ordered his troops to fire upon their compatriots.

"The condition of affairs seemed desperate. The Turks advanced to the centre of the country, spreading devastation in their path. However, Russia came to the rescue, the Turks were driven back, Servia emerged with her independence more secure and her territory extended. But the prestige of Kara George had suffered and the country resented his autocracy. He was, however, very skillful in detaching his leading opponents. Among these was a young man named Milosh Obrenovich. Brought before a tribunal, he refused all concessions, and observed coolly, 'I know that you will not condemn me, for I am beloved of the people.' Kara George took a fancy to him and attached him to his person. In 1811 Kara George was Prince of the Servians with practically unlimited power. Two years later he was a fugitive and an exile, branded with the stigma of cowardice.

"The event which led up to this disaster was the Treaty of Bucharest (May 28, 1812), by which Russia agreed that the Servians should retain self-government, but submit to Turkey. This was interpreted by the Porte to mean a permanent occupation of Servia and a complete disarmament of the Servians. This time the mistake of despising the Servians was not made, and the Grand Vizier took the field in person. Veljko, a former outlaw, bore the brunt of the first onslaught, and only succumbed because Kara George refused him the succor he demanded. Had Kara George been true to his duties and his traditions, the situation might yet have been saved. But he seemed suddenly to have lost his nerve. He hesitated; he retreated; none knew where he was. The whole country, in despair, took up the plaintive refrain of a national ballad, 'Kara George, Kara George, where art thou?' The answer was that he had taken all his portable treasures, buried the rest and fled ignominiously to Austria, abandoning his people to their fate."

This took place on October 13, 1813. The idol had fallen from its pedestal. But why a tyrannical man subject to fits of insane violence, an illiterate peasant who when, during the Austrian raid, he tramped to the frontier with his pigs and his parents, shot his aged father because he refused to cross the Save; who, when his mother tried to cheat him out of a beehive, bonneted her with it and stalked off, regardless of the piercing shrieks she gave at every sting; who, hearing his only brother accused as a gay Lothario, hanged him over his own doorpost with a bridle; who killed

a faithful comrade at a whisper of treachery, and when he found out his mistake cried like a baby; who, grim and black, would sit silently for whole days, gnawing his nails and never uttering a word—why such a man should not only be idolized, but become the founder of a royal dynasty, is one of those incongruities, those anomalies, those strange freaks of fortune which illustrate the oft-repeated aphorism that truth is stranger than fiction.

Both the rival dynasties which have contended for the sovereignty of Servia were founded by peasants. Milosh Obrenovich, founder of the line, the last representative of which was the murdered King Alexander, was the son of Theodore, a poor farm laborer, who had married the widow of a well-to-do peasant named Obren. As a boy he grew up amid pigs and piggeries. He was a swineherd to his father and his half-brother, Milan, with whom he was out in the insurrection of 1804, and when the latter died he assumed the name of Obrenovich, the affix "vich" having the same signification as O or Mac in Ireland. After the mysterious disappearance of Kara George, when the Servians dispersed and he was urged to escape across the frontier, he replied that he could not leave his old mother, his wife and his children to be sold like sheep. A few mountaineers first joined, but soon deserted him. To save his country and his race from annihilation, he lent a willing ear to the Pasha of Belgrade, who invited his coöperation in a work of pacification, for it did not fall in with Turkish policy to exterminate the Servians. "Slim," like the Boers, he temporized, biding his time. Both were opportunists. It suited the Pasha to be conciliatory and Milosh to be pliant. He accepted every mark of favor from the Turkish Satrap, who called him his "adopted son" and helped him to stifle premature risings.

When the hour struck for action, he was the first to give the signal and lead on to victory. Finding that the Pasha was not to be trusted, Milosh fled to the mountains of Rudnik, and on Palm Sunday, 1815, he raised the standard of insurrection at Takovo, which is accordingly known as the cradle of Servian liberty. Arms, which had been hidden away in the forests and mountain caverns, were brought out, and Milosh was soon at the head of a formidable array. The old guerrilla tactics were adopted, women, children and monks transforming themselves into sharpshooters behind every rock. After a series of successful surprises, the insurgents obtained a signal victory on the Kolubara and captured several cannon. Refugees began to return from Austria, and soon Milosh was able to march upon Pozharevato, which was taken after prodigies of valor. When ammunition failed, the Servians fought with their daggers, even with their nails and teeth. Milosh showed himself

as different from Kara George in victory as in distress. The Turks were allowed to depart with the honors of war, and they bore testimony to the care which he lavished upon their wounded. It was not, however, to be expected that the Sultan would submit to the loss of Serbia without a struggle. Two armies were sent out: Milosh defeated one, the other made proposals of peace. Just as the leaders of former insurrections had claimed to fight, not against the Sultan, but against his enemies, the Janissaries, so now Milosh complained only of the Pasha's tyranny at Belgrade and protested his fealty to the Sultan. This afforded the Turks a pretext for honorable retreat, and local self-government was promptly conceded, chiefly, perhaps, through fear of Russia. The Pasha, then, had recourse to intrigue, seeking to stir up jealousies against Milosh, who was, however, well able to take care of himself. His most dangerous rival proved to be Kara George, who suddenly returned from Bessarabia, intending to head a fresh insurrection against the Turkish garrisons in Serbia. Milosh quickly perceived that such a movement was premature and sent Vuitsa Vulitsevich, an ex-vojvode, to persuade Kara George to stay away. Vuitsa exceeded his instructions, and, finding Kara George obdurate, cut off his head (at Semendria, July 24, 1817) and sent it to Milosh, who was beside himself with grief. The old chief was buried with much solemnity at Topola, and Milosh's wife accompanied the remains for several days' journey on their way to the grave; but the Turks carried off his head and exposed it on the gates of the Seraglio at Constantinople, with the superscription, "Head of the famous Servian bandit, Kara George."⁴

Thus far the English writer quoted, who is a warm partisan of the Obrenovich dynasty, a friend of the late King Alexander and Queen Draga, whose atrocious murder he rightly reprobates. But there is another version of the death of Kara George. A writer in the *Contemporary Review* (July, 1903) gave publicity to an autobiographical testament written by Milosh, taken from the Servian archives by Milan and left to his illegitimate son, who now resides with his mother at Constantinople, and is said to aspire to the reversion of the throne. In this document he says: "We served faithfully Karageorgevich (Kara George) until he grew puffed up and became a tyrant. He sought to become the ally of a great Emperor⁵ and to entangle us in his quarrels. Our family saw through him and judged him righteously according to the course he had taken, and we revolted against Karageorgevich and turned him away. We should have killed him had we caught him, for he

⁴ "The Servian Tragedy," *Hist. Intro.*, pp. 10-12.

⁵ Emperor of Austria.

treacherously slew our brother. He came back twelve years later. On learning that he was in the country, I sent word to the chief of Palanka to send me his head. Voutch cut it off, and I received it from him, and Servia has had rest and quarreled with nobody ever since."

Servia does not seem to have enjoyed much rest under any of its rulers, and it is restless still. These little mushroom monarchies in the Balkan Peninsula have not yet struck any very deep roots: they are excrescences or outgrowths of a mixed civilization, half European, half Oriental. Their founders were only half-civilized nomads, peasants wholly lacking in culture of mind or morals. The blighting influence of Ottomanism is over them all. Though nominally Catholic, schism has narrowed their conception of a Church, and they have wholly failed to grasp the idea of universality, of a world-embracing Church, gathering every nation within its capacious fold. Their horizon is closed by their mountains; they have no breadth of mind or of purview. Cut off from unity, they are deprived of the chastening, elevating and refining influence of Catholicism as represented by Rome and the Churches in communion with the Holy See. Had it been otherwise, it would have fared better with the people as a nation. As it is, they have suffered from a succession of rulers who, ostensibly Christian, were cast in a Mohammedan mould. Milosh, for instance, had no higher conception of sovereignty than that suggested by the petty despotism of a Turkish Pasha. His morals and his methods were alike Turkish. He put down a rebellion with a rough and ruthless hand; foreign participators had their hands and tongues cut off in Kragujevat's market place before his eyes and natives were broken on the wheel. When he wanted to improve his capital, he ordered a whole suburb of Belgrade to be set on fire. Although a great national assembly, convened on November 6, 1817, conferred on him the title of Prince of the Servians, he governed without a Parliament and levied what taxes he pleased. Expropriation, we know, has been the order of the day in France and Italy, but thinly veiled under form of law. Milosh dispensed with legal formalities and appropriated whatever property chanced to take his fancy, whether lands, houses, jewels or lovely maidens, like any Oriental despot. Formally recognized by the Porte in 1830 on condition that he administered the affairs of Servia by and with the consent of an assembly of Servian notables, he still continued his absolutism, raised and abased officials arbitrarily and punished with the bastinado all who displeased him. A formidable insurrection broke out in 1835. A Constitution was wrung from him conferring democratic institutions, but he disregarded it. Russian

diplomacy, however, prevailed, and, by what has been called "a masterpiece of Russo-Turkish liberalism," a Council was established, practically setting aside Milosh's rule and governing in his stead.

The tables were turned. He was now virtually a prisoner in his own palace. On receiving from the Russian Consul assurances that he would thereby secure the succession for his son, he abdicated on June 13, 1839. His eldest son, Milan, then incurably ill, died on July 8 of the same year, ignorant of the fictitious and fleeting dignity that had been conferred upon him, and was succeeded by his next brother, Michael, a lad of sixteen, upon whom the Porte imposed a Regency, against which he chafed and protested. Several thousands of peasants rose in arms, marched on Belgrade and took Michael away from the Regents, who fled to Constantinople, leaving him free to govern according to democratic ideas. As he would not join in a Bulgarian insurrection, his own mother, Lynbitsa, conspired to bring about the return of her husband. Failing to suppress the conspiracy and deserted by his troops, he retired to Austria.

In 1842, the younger son of Kara George, Alexander Karageorgevich, a man of thirty-six, who had been living in Servia on a pension granted him by Milosh, was elected Prince. Another conspiracy drove him to seek refuge in the Turkish fortress at Belgrade, and on December 23, 1858, he was deposed by the Skupsh-tina, which recalled Milosh at the age of seventy-eight, after nearly twenty years' exile. Upon his death on September 26, 1860, he was succeeded by his son Michael, who established a standing army and expelled the Turkish garrisons from the fortresses they still occupied. Meanwhile Alexander Karageorgevich had not acquiesced in his deposition. A plot for his restoration culminated on June 10, 1868, in the assassination of Michael. Besides the actual murderers, several conspirators were shot, and Alexander Karageorgevich was sentenced by the Servian courts to twenty years' penal servitude for complicity in the plot. But the Hungarian Government refused to give him up, and he was ultimately released after eight years' imprisonment.

The next ruler the Servians gave themselves was a young scapegrace of fourteen, Milan, grandson of old Milosh's brother Ephrem. The son of Marie Catarji, a Frenchwoman of Roumanian origin, early separated from her husband and who had led a very free and easy life among the rakes of the Second Empire; educated by a Paris professor who was an atheist and a cynic; and a precocious profligate among the profligate idlers of that gay and guilty city, he was utterly *blasé* at the age of fourteen. His career as a juvenile sovereign was in keeping with the vicious upbringing of a youth

who had known none of the restraints of religion. Until he came of age he was a mere puppet in the hands of Regents who pandered to his passions, and whose control he eventually shook off only to fall under the evil spell of a loose woman, who embittered the life of his Queen, Nathalie (daughter of Colonel Keshko, a Russian, a wealthy landowner in Bessarabia), whom she persuaded him to divorce. After his military failures, domestic scandals, exactions and tyrannical rule had alienated the people, he abdicated, it is believed under the hypnotic influence of his paramour. He was succeeded by his young son, Alexander Obrenovich, born on August 14, 1876, and crowned on July 2, 1889, in the monastery of Zhicha, near Kraljevo, the oldest monastery in the country, built in 1210. His life and his fate were alike sad. "I am an orphan whose parents are still alive," observed the boy-King to one of his tutors on the day he received the allegiance of his subjects. As a Frenchman said, "*Il n'eut pas d'enfance.*" Milijevich, a cousin of Karageorgievich, gives this glimpse of his indoor life during the Regency:

"The Regents allowed no scope to his affectionate sentiments; no friend of his own age, no tutor who had the qualities requisite to direct his heart or mind. They wanted to bring him up for themselves. A man slept on the mat outside his apartments. He lay down at eight in the evening and rose at five—the same hour as the King. He had orders to let nobody in after ten and to take the name of every one who entered before that hour. The King, feeling himself spied upon, grew shy and secretive, and took pleasure in circumventing the Regents."

They expelled his mother, but by a clever *coup d'état* on April 1, 1893 (O. S.), when he proclaimed himself of age and took the reins of government into his own hands at sixteen, he dismissed them and deprived them of the power they had misused. He was, however, himself compelled for state reasons to banish his own father, who had been spending in dissipation the handsome civil list pension he had extorted as the price of his abdication and intriguing to regain power. On the 5th of August, 1900, he took the fatal step which led to his downfall and death, when he was joined in wedlock in the Cathedral of Belgrade to Madame Draga Mashin, the handsome widow of a Bohemian engineer, whose father had been Prince Michael's physician and who himself had been agent for a swindling French bank, which collapsed after defrauding the Comte de Chambord of £20,000 and Leo XIII. of £100,000. Born on September 24, 1867, at Milanovats, a little fishing village on the Danube, she could, nevertheless, boast of ancestors who had been prominent among the vojvodes, or national leaders who gathered round Milosh in the war of independence. The daughter

of Pante Lunjevitsa, who had been Prefect of Shabats and had fallen into poverty, her income only amounted to £2 12s. a month when she captured the heart of King Alexander, who raised her to a throne and made her Queen Draga. It were far better for her had she remained in the obscurity of poverty than to be thrust into the glare and glitter of "the fierce light that beats upon a throne," the target for the poisoned darts of malevolent criticism, and for him, and for the country of which he was the ruler, had he formed an alliance with one of the reigning houses of Europe. Some such alliance was on the *tapis*, for one night at a state ball in Berlin the German Empress took aside the Servian Minister and congratulated him on what was thought to be the approaching marriage of King Alexander with a certain German princess. "You could not have a better Queen," said Her Majesty; "she has a heart of gold, she is as charming as she is beautiful, and she has told me that for the last two or three years she has been learning the Servian language and interesting herself in the Servian people, over whom she is destined to rule."

But a cruel destiny had decreed otherwise. Early on the morning of June 11, 1903, a treasonable plot, which for two years had been slowly elaborated, ended in the assassination of the King and Queen and the principal Ministers, one of the prime movers being Colonel Mashin, Queen Draga's brother-in-law by her first marriage, and the hired assassins,⁶ a gang of officers of the Sixth Regiment, who did their bloody work with shocking brutality. The people were terrorized into acquiescence in what the plotters proclaimed "a glorious revolution," which has seated on the throne the present ruler, King Peter, grandson of Kara George and son of Alexander Karageorgevich, who reigned from 1842 to 1858.

History repeated itself in the environment in which the present sovereign of Serbia grew up. The grandson of the peasant-founder of the reigning house was educated in a common school, sat on a wooden bench among peasant boys, played with them in the streets of Belgrade, where he was born in 1846, and was known by the name of "Pera" to his school companions. When his father was exiled to Hungary, the family lived like rustics, but the boy was sent to a boarding school in Geneva, from which, in 1863, he was withdrawn and sent to France, first to the Lycée of Sainte Barbe and then to the Military Academy of Saint Cyr. During the Franco-German War he served in the Foreign Legion and in 1875 was one of the chief organizers of the revolt of Bosnia against

⁶ The total sum, it is said, paid out in rewards for the crime amounted to £12,000. The sixty-eight regicides were allowed to retain their commissions despite a protest from a large majority of Servian officers.

Turkey, commanding, under the name of Captain Merkunich, a small company of volunteers. From his boyhood he cherished hopes of ascending the throne of his not very remote ancestors and is assumed to have conspired, or at least manœuvred, to that end. He married Zorka, daughter of the Prince of Montenegro, and his sons were educated in the Military Academy at St. Petersburg. His cousin, Alexis, as representative of the elder branch of the family, had a prior right to the succession, but he had no partisans in Servia to support his claim. His successful competitor is described as a tall, spare, military-looking man, with a sinister, hawklike face, marked by deep lines, grayish hair and moustache and shifty eyes.⁷

The capital, primitively Beograd, or the White City, now Belgrade, or the Beautiful City, is a smaller Budapest, as Budapest is a smaller Paris. On the terraced heights overlooking the town many a Servian patriot was impaled by the Turks and left to linger in agony. The ubiquitous Jew is very much in evidence, and the almost equally ubiquitous Scot has handed his name down to Servian posterity in a street—in fact, in a whole quarter, which bears a phonetic version of Mackenzie, the patronymic of an interesting speculator from north of the Tweed who made his pile in the Balkans. Belgrade is almost an entirely new city, like Sofia, where the old wooden houses fed the Russian camp fires. The citadel, the mosque, a few fountains with Turkish inscriptions and a ruined arch, called the Gate of Constantinople, are the only visible reminders of the extinct Moslem domination.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

ENGLAND BEFORE EMANCIPATION.¹

NO READER of Monsignor Ward's two handsome volumes will be likely to lay them down without expressing the opinion that the author has produced a work of permanent historic interest and value. The period with which Mgr. Ward had to deal was one of infinite complexity, and such were the conditions prevailing within the ranks of the Catholic community, both clerical and lay, there must have been many temptations to the

⁷ Vivian, p. 140.

¹ "The Eve of Catholic Emancipation, Being the History of the English Catholics During the First Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century." By the Right Rev. Mgr. Ward, F. R., Hl. S., president of St. Edmund's College. London, Longmans, Green & Co., Paternoster Row. Vols. I. and II.

author to draw a veil over some of the episodes of the time. Mgr. Ward, however, possesses the instincts of the true historian, and acting on the counsels of Leo XIII. to all students of history—having found the truth—he tells exactly what occurred, disregarding the scruples which might have trammelled the pen of a weaker man. In this fact lies the great value of his work. Moreover, the learned president of St. Edmund's College brought to the discharge of the task he undertook a perfectly impartial mind, one totally divested, for the time being, at any rate, of anything in the nature of national bias or prejudice, and this other fact enables him to describe and judge the relations between the Catholics of Ireland and England in perfectly just proportions and with accurate discrimination between their respective positions throughout the long battle for Emancipation. How terribly strained the relations in question often were Mgr. Ward enables his readers to discern, but he generally leaves judgment as to who was or was not to blame to their impartiality. The truth, as might have been expected, is that neither side could claim to have been always in the right; but for this it would be unjust to hastily conclude that the side which—for the time being—was in the wrong was necessarily culpably so. The situation which existed at the time described by Mgr. Ward was enormously complicated, and if the position of Great Britain is fairly taken into account, it will seem almost marvelous that her public men and statesmen were found willing to devote as much attention as many of them undoubtedly did to the Catholic question. In this respect it may be accepted as certain that Ireland was the compelling strategic influence. The Catholics of Great Britain were an insignificant minority in the midst of an overwhelmingly Protestant population. The Catholics of Ireland, on the other hand, were to all intents and purposes a nation in themselves, and, what was more, a nation whose friendship, while she was surrounded by many enemies, was of eminent importance to Great Britain. It was, however, perfectly natural that the leading Catholics in the latter country should occasionally fail to quite recognize this truth. They were, most of them, persons of considerable social importance, to whom the idea of subordinating their personal ideas on points of political propriety to the more militant policy of their Irish brethren was often peculiarly galling. It was remembrance of this circumstance which once induced O'Connell—in a moment of aggravation—to declare that he had "emancipated them in spite of themselves."

In the preface to his first two volumes Mgr. Ward quite rightly says: "Politically speaking, Emancipation was from the beginning an Irish, not an English question; yet for a considerable time after the Act of Union the English Catholics had quite as much to say

in negotiating the matter as their brethren across the water. This was partly due to their being on the spot and partly to their possessing in their own body men of position and influence. Their demand was naturally different in character from that of the Irish, which was the agitation of the greater part of the nation. Hence arose a difference of opinion as to the conditions to be offered or accepted, of which the well-known Veto question forms an important, though by no means a solitary, instance. Owing partly to a difference of temperament, and partly to the difference of circumstances and history, it is never too easy for the Irish and English Catholics to act politically together; the difficulty was emphasized during the years which succeeded the passing of the Union. Gradually there arose a double movement, one of the nature of a petition for Emancipation, accompanied with a willingness to accept what became known as 'securities,' which the lay leaders in England—and also the aristocratic party in Ireland—represented; the other the demand for 'Unconditional Emancipation' on the part of the Irish, which grew in force as years went on. In the event the English Catholics failed to obtain Emancipation. They did indeed pass it through the House of Commons; but all their personal influence did not succeed in inducing the Peers to vote for it. Where their influence failed, the agitation of the Irish eventually succeeded. The bills of 1813 and 1821—the latter of which passed the House of Commons—were drafted by Charles Butler; the bill of 1825 was drafted by O'Connell; and although that, too, was thrown out by the Lords, by this time the Irish Catholic Association had established its power, and four years later Emancipation was forced from an unwilling Government: for when Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington declared in favor of it, they did so avowedly as the lesser of two evils, and because the state of Ireland had become such that it had become in their opinion ungovernable by any other policy." This is a perfectly correct description of a situation which was unfortunately too prolonged. One of the most prominent figures in Mgr. Ward's narrative is, as was indeed inevitable, the famous Bishop Milner. Commencing his career as a warm advocate of admission of the right of Veto on the part of the Crown or Government over the appointment of a particular nominee to a Catholic bishopric, Milner became a furious opponent of its acceptance and denounced in the most vehement terms, as potential heretics and schismatics, all whom he suspected of willingness to purchase Emancipation by offering any such "security." The simple truth about the Veto principle, of course, is that, both then and now, if any fair and friendly government had valid objection—on the ground of dis-

loyalty or otherwise—to offer to the appointment of any nominee for episcopal place the Holy See would be almost certain to give its representations the most careful consideration. Realization of this obvious truth appears to have always been absent from Milner's mind as well as from that of O'Connell, but it may no doubt be fairly argued that recognition of its certainty is a different thing from admission of a statutory or treaty right on the part of a secular authority to interfere in or influence ecclesiastical appointments. In the case of Ireland, the exercise of any such controlling or even supervisory power by the rulers of Protestant England would undoubtedly have proved seriously injurious to the authority of the episcopacy and probably have worked serious harm. On this latter point there is indeed little room for question, and Irish Catholics have ample ground for satisfaction in the circumstance that, when Emancipation was eventually secured, it was obtained free from any such deplorable condition. At the same time it is impossible not to read some of Milner's denunciations of his episcopal colleagues with regret that he should have used language of the unmeasured kind he constantly did.

On this point Mgr. Ward says: "Even apart from his literary work, for which Bishop Milner is justly famous, viewing him simply as a man of action, no one will now question that he was the greater and stronger man of the two"—he and Bishop Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London District—"and he left a more lasting impress of his work on English Catholicism of his day. Nevertheless, he had grave faults, which have not always been remembered by those who have estimated the value of his work. It must be remembered that hitherto practically the only source of information as to the merits of his disputes has been his own writings: Husenbeth, in his biography of Milner, naturally accepts his version without question, and Father Amherst, in his *History of Catholic Emancipation*, does so no less completely. Now Milner was essentially a special pleader, and his writings give only a one-sided view of the case. If such a man as the saintly Abbé Carron, of Somers Town, could give it as his deliberate opinion that the raising of Milner to the episcopate was a calamity to the Catholic Church in England, and if Bishop Bramston, the meekest of men, could speak of him as a greater enemy to religion than Luther himself, it is evident that there was at least another side to the question. That side has never been satisfactorily put forward in print. Charles Butler has indeed written in defense of Dr. Poynter, but only a very few pages; and in any case he is hardly the apologist whom the Bishop would have chosen; while Dr. Poynter himself, with a self-restraint which bordered on heroism, uniformly refrained from

writing in answer to the repeated attacks on him which Milner was continually making in pamphlets and other publications, in the *Orthodox Journal*, and even in his episcopal pastorals. He, however, kept many documents together, and left them behind him for the use of future generations, so that (as he said) Milner's accounts should not go down unchallenged to posterity as English Church history." No one who views the portrait and photograph of a bust of Dr. Poynter and notes the high-bred and gentle, sweetly ascetic features of that holy prelate can fail to realize how much he must have suffered under the constant and sledgehammer attacks of his more coarse-fibred, but equally devoted assailant. That Milner was not as much actuated by conscientious motives, whether acting as a Vetoist or as an anti-Vetoist, need not be questioned. What is most to be regretted is that he allowed both his pen and his tongue to run away with him as they so often did. All the same, he left Catholic Ireland his debtor, and thereby left the Church his debtor.

Milner was consecrated Bishop and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District at Winchester in 1803, while Dr. Poynter was consecrated and became Vicar of the London District only a week later. It was probably one of the ironies of fate that Milner should have been the preacher on the latter occasion, and that a considerable portion of his discourse was devoted to a eulogy of the existing circumstances of the Church in England—so far as its internal affairs were concerned, while he told the congregation that "many things regarding religion were settled with perfect unanimity." It may be as well at this point to set out what exactly were the grievances under which the Catholics of England labored at this moment. The majority of these had their origin in secular disabilities, for they had enjoyed practically complete freedom of conscience since the passage of the Relief Act of 1791. At the same time they had some serious injustices of a religious nature still to complain of, and Mgr. Ward quotes a list of these, drawn up in 1804 by Bishop Douglas, at the request of Mr. Brockholes, a member of an eminent Lancashire family, who desired to submit them to the Government in the hope of securing their abolition. The list was as follows:

"1. That of Catholic marriages or of marriages of Catholics celebrated by Catholic priests being deemed invalid by the existing laws, so that if one of the parties quit the other *quacunque de causa*, the deserted party receives no relief from the parish nor redress from the law of his or her country. The priest also, it is said, may be transported or put in prison and condemned to transportation for having married the parties.

"2. That of foundations or of moneys appropriated for the main-

tenance of priests or to the support of Catholic worship, are deemed by the existing laws to be appropriated *to superstitious purposes*, and as such are liable to confiscation: and when alienated or seized upon by malevolent persons, cannot be recovered by law. Instances of such alienations and seizures might be adduced.

"3. That of Catholics serving in His Majesty's army and navy being withheld from attending divine service according to the rite of their own religion on Sundays and festivals and of their being compelled to go to Protestant churches on those days *against their will*—an evil that leads brave and loyal subjects to complain and to be discontented, etc., etc., at a time when every hand and heart should be united to oppose the enemy; and the United Kingdom should be as one man."

The civil disabilities of which the Catholics complained practically deprived them of most of the rights of citizenship, and these are quoted by Mgr. Ward from a list prepared by Charles Butler in the following terms:

"1. By the 13th Charles II., commonly called the Corporation Act, their whole body is excluded from offices in cities and corporations.

"2. By the 25th Charles II., commonly called the Test Act, their whole body is excluded from civil and military offices. . . .

"3. By the 7th and 8th William III., c. 27th, Roman Catholics are liable to be prevented from voting at elections.

"4. By the 30th Charles II. s. 2, c. 1, Roman Catholic Peers are prevented from filling their hereditary seats in Parliament.

"5. By the same statute Roman Catholics are prevented from sitting in the House of Commons.

"6th. By several statutes Roman Catholics are disabled from presenting to advowsons, a legal incident of property which the law allows even to the Jew."

It is worthy of note that the right of presenting to advowsons—that is, appointing Protestant ministers to benefices owned by Catholics—is still denied to members of the old faith; but it can scarcely be alleged that this is a matter of serious moment. In the case of converts, however, who have relatives ministers of the Church of England, the disability is sometimes resented. Whether or not a Catholic—even if free to do so—could conscientiously appoint a clergyman of a heterodox creed is probably a question upon which theologians would have a great deal to say. All the other disabilities enumerated by Butler have ceased to exist.

Both Milner and Butler recognized, much as they constantly differed upon other points, that on the passage of the Act of Union and on the consequent recognition of Ireland as an integral portion

of the United Kingdom the balance of Catholic political power passed to the Catholics of that country. In 1807 the Bishop wrote: "The fate of us English Catholics depends on that of our brethren in Ireland. If their claims are overlooked, ours will never be thought worthy of notice. On the other hand, whatever redress of grievances or legal privileges they obtain, we shall not long remain deprived of. Our political weight and importance compared with theirs is small indeed. In a word, they are the stately vessel which catches the breeze and stems the tide; we are the cockboat which is towed in her wake." With absolute correctness, Mgr. Ward says that the Catholic religion had indeed never been kept under in Ireland quite as it had been in England. Mass was not entirely proscribed there in the eighteenth century; for with the greater part of the nation Catholic, it would have been practically impossible to carry out such a measure.² There were indeed many persecuting restrictions; but notwithstanding these, priests continued to be appointed in every parish, and the clergy retained their influence over the people. A still more important difference concerned the episcopate. Although the law tolerated parish priests, by a strange contradiction it refused to tolerate Bishops. They were condemned to banishment, and if they returned, to death. Nevertheless, the Irish kept up the succession of their episcopate without intermission, though the Bishops often had to go by false names and to conceal themselves when searched for. It was to this double preservation of Bishops and parish priests that Cardinal Manning always attributed the preservation of the faith among the people.³ Their pastors were their natural leaders, and never lost that position. The troubles between the laymen and the Bishops in England during the last part of the eighteenth century had no counterpart in the sister isle. The Bishops and clergy together led a body forming the greater part of the nation, and their strength was certain in the end to assert itself. Nevertheless, the laws regulating worship under the well-known Acts of Queen Anne⁴ were very severe, and during the first half of the eighteenth century many of them were enforced. All the regular clergy were subject to banishment, and although a secular priest was allowed in each parish, he was forbidden to have a curate. He was required to register his name and place of abode, and was not allowed to officiate elsewhere. Over 1,000

² In general, the hopeless task of preventing some three-fourths of the nation from celebrating the rites which they believed essential to their salvation was not attempted.—Lecky, "Ireland in the Eighteenth Century," I., p. 156.

³ Pastoral Office, p. 222.

⁴ "An act to prevent the further growth of Popery" (1704), and "a further act" (1709), termed by Edmund Burke the "ferocious acts of Queen Anne."

parish priests immediately registered themselves; but as time went on it became doubtful whether new priests would be allowed to register, especially as by the later Act a new oath was prescribed, declaring that the "Pretender" had no right or title to the Crown of England, which the clergy as a whole considered that they could not conscientiously take.⁶ For this reason they ceased to apply for registration and in practice numerous unregistered priests, both secular and regular, exercised their ministry in evasion of the law. The old parish churches were all in the hands of the Protestants; but Catholics were allowed to have a "chapel" in each parish. This was often little more than a barn or hovel, but it served to enable the people to hear Mass under shelter. There was a curious provision that it should not have a steeple or bell, nor be surmounted by a cross.⁶ Presumably the object of this restriction—which had a counterpart so lately as in the English Act of 1791 and the Irish Act of 1793—was to be a continual reminder that a Catholic place of worship was not a "church" in the legal acceptance of the term, and the distinction between "church" and "chapel" acquired a meaning which has survived to our own day. The difficulty about the prohibition of a bell to call the people to service in days when clocks and watches were not plentiful was often surmounted by hanging a bell on a neighboring tree. In the outlying districts Mass was often said in out-of-the-way sheds, or even in the open air under a tree;⁷ and there were various secret signs to inform the people when and where it was to be celebrated. But although the celebration of Mass was in a certain measure tolerated, it was still obligatory by law to attend the (Protestant) parish church on Sunday, under an old unrepealed Elizabethan statute, the penalty for non-compliance being one shilling each time.⁸ And in order to decoy the clergy, it was enacted by a further statute of Queen Anne in 1709 that every priest who turned Protestant became entitled to an annuity of £30 a year for life.⁹

The mere fact that one thousand parish priests so promptly took advantage of the Act permitting registration shows that they were already officiating among the people. Indeed, it is doubtful if the lot of an informer, and especially of an informer against a priest, was ever a happy one in Ireland, and it may be doubted if many

⁶ Lecky, I., p. 159. Under the previous act they were bound to take an oath of allegiance to the reigning power. This they freely took, but to disclaim any right or title for the "Pretender" was a further step, to which they felt they could not in conscience proceed.

⁶ Lecky, I., p. 156; Parnell, "History of the Penal Laws," p. 41.

⁷ Lecky, I., p. 267.

⁸ Parnell, p. 20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

of the type ever indulged in the profitable occupation a second time. We have, for instance, heard of a case which occurred in the County Kerry in the seventeenth century, in which a wretched miller, for some base reason of his own, proposed to give information that the young heir of a considerable property was a Catholic. This miserable man, like most of his class at the time, could neither read nor write, and on his design in some way becoming known, a deputation of the tenantry of the aforesaid heir waited on him at night and removed his tongue. The outrage, of course, was a terrible one, but the estates were saved and remained in the possession of the descendants of the heir until they were recently sold, under Mr. Wyndham's Land Purchase Act, to the then tenants, some of whom are descendants of members of the deputation which called at the mill two hundred years ago. It is incidents of this kind which explain the confusion of thought sometimes found to exist among the Irish peasantry as regards the sanctity of "law and order." The act committed was, of course, as repugnant to the law of the Church as to the statute law, but it can scarcely be denied that it had some excuse and was certainly ingenious. The miller laid no information. Long oppressed though they had been, and deprived so far as possible of all opportunities for education at home, the Catholics of Ireland, as soon as the Penal laws were relaxed, rapidly grew in wealth and social importance. In 1807 Milner visited the country, and he has left on record an account of the conditions he found existing, which is quoted by Mgr. Ward. He wrote: "Industrious, intelligent, honest and frugal, they have acquired by commerce or trade not only the conveniences of life, but also the means of purchasing considerable portions of the inheritance of their forefathers, which the luxury of the present nobility and gentry has obliged the latter to sell. It is said that more than two-thirds of the real property which has been sold of late years in Ireland has been bought by Catholics; and a well-informed writer asserts that within the last twelvemonth alone they have purchased lands to the amount of above £800,000. From what I myself can observe, it is clear to me that upon the whole there is now a vast deal more wealth amongst the Irish than amongst the English Catholics, notwithstanding so many of the latter are persons of noble families and of great landed property." Mgr. Ward himself says that: "At the time when Milner wrote Catholic 'chapels' were rising everywhere of large size and elaborate design. The movement had been helped on by the action of the Orangemen in the North during the rebellion in 1798; for they had burned or destroyed numerous chapels, for which the Government made compensation; and by the further aid of volun-

tary contributions they were rebuilt on an improved scale. In other parts of Ireland the Catholics were stimulated by this example, and Milner enumerates ten prominent churches which he himself had seen, either in use or in course of construction. He awards the palm to the new Cathedral at Waterford for its exterior and that at Cork for its interior. He also mentions the church at Thurles, then in course of construction. The Pro-Cathedral in Marlborough street, Dublin, was begun in 1815.¹⁰ This movement has gone forward ever since, the two noble cathedrals at Queens-town and Armagh being the most notable examples in recent years. Moreover, the movement has not been confined to cathedrals and parish churches, but has extended to convents and charitable institutions of all kinds. Together with increase of wealth amongst Catholics came also a sense of their own power. We can again quote Milner.¹¹ He calls it 'one of the political phenomena of the present times; a people without any revolution or other visible cause rising as it were all at once from apparent insignificance and absolute contempt to the first rank of importance and respectability in the scale of nations.' " At the same time that developments such as these were taking place the Protestant Ascendancy party were carrying on an elaborate and highly organized system of proselytism, liberally subsidized by the Westminster Parliament, for the uprooting of the Catholic faith amongst the poorer section of the people. It is only just to state, however, that the subsidy in question was only paid in continuation of grants long quoted by Grattan's Irish Parliament, which was, of course, exclusively Protestant in composition. Of this base system Milner wrote, and there was no exaggeration in his words: "I have already had abundant means of learning that the Protestants of Ireland in almost every part of it are possessed of the most ardent zeal for proselytizing the Catholics; and this not by any means of cool conviction and edifying example, but by downright bribes and terror. Here a Protestant lady clothes, feeds and provides for Catholic children exclusively, whose parents will sell them to her at this price, for the sake of bringing them up Protestants; there a Protestant landlord turns all his Catholic tenants out of their farms or exacts an oath as a condition of holding them, that they will send their children to a Protestant school, which he has set up for the express purpose of proselytism. But why should I dwell on the private instances of the system of Protestant proselytizing when it has been publicly professed and acted upon by the Government of the country ever since it gave

¹⁰ It took a long time to build, and was not roofed in until 1823. The first public service in it was the funeral of Dr. Troy in that year.

¹¹ "Letters From Ireland," p. 4.

up that of putting its subjects to death for adhering to their religion? In fact, sir, unexampled as such proceedings are in past times, astonishing as they will appear in ages to come, no less than £25,000 continue annually to be levied in a great measure upon the Catholics themselves independently of the rents of immense landed estates, for purchasing the children of indigent Catholics (inasmuch as no Protestant child can be admitted into a charter school unless a sufficient number of Catholic children cannot be procured) and educating them in the Protestant religion. In still greater violation of the laws of nature, these purchased victims are uniformly transported in covered wagons or carts to the greatest distance possible from the residence of their parents—the children of the Northern provinces being conveyed to the charter schools of the South and those of the South to the schools in the North, in order that the parent may never have the consolation of embracing the child, lest he or she should again make a Papist of it; and the child may never enjoy the advantage of a parent's love and support, for fear it should thereby lose those religious impressions which at so great an expense have been wrought upon it! The Turks indeed take away the children of their Greek subjects in order to recruit the ranks of their janissaries; but they do this from a motive of policy, not of religion; the Irish Government alone of all Governments of the world violates the laws of God and nature in extinguishing parental and filial affection and in separating parents and children for life from a principle of proselytism."¹² The whole business was simply abominable and shameful, and the only marvel is that it proved absolutely futile against the almost stolid determination of even the most poverty-stricken among the people to have nothing to do with the creed of Luther, which they refused to accept instead of that of the Apostles. That, however, it should produce a certain amount of demoralization and of double-facedness amongst those who were subjected to its debasing influence was probably inevitable. In the estimation of its managers, however, even this was not a disadvantage.

If we now turn to the consideration of the state of the Catholic religion in England and of the regrettable differences of opinion which arose between Dr. Poynter and Dr. Milner, it is impossible not to see that the conflict between them was largely due to the wide difference between their personal characteristics. Describing these, Mgr. Ward says: "The consecration of Bishops Milner and Poynter introduced two important new elements into the counsels of the vicars apostolic, destined in their different ways to exert far-reaching influence. Dr. Poynter's work lay largely in the future;

¹² "Letters From Ireland," p. 22.

for he was at this time only a coadjutor, and had to keep his own views subservient to those of his chief, Bishop Douglas. Nevertheless, from the beginning his influence was felt. He was a well-read theologian, fresh from his books—for he continued to teach theology at St. Edmund's College—and had both the strength and the weakness of a man accustomed to scholastic disputation. He had a strong faculty for reasoning and for accurate thought so often produced by that study; but he was also not devoid of its frequent accompaniment in such surroundings, a mind that can perhaps be not unfairly described as argumentative. Being the junior Bishop at the Synod of Winchester and Old Hall, it devolved on him to prepare the matter for the discussions and to report the decisions adopted, which duties he discharged to the satisfaction of all. Throughout his episcopate his familiarity with all the departments of theology and canon law were of good service to his brethren. If ever it became necessary to prepare a case to be referred to Rome, he was able to state it accurately and concisely and in attractive Latin, for he was a master of that language. He was equally fluent in French, the knowledge of which he had acquired during his long residence at Douay, and he had also a fair knowledge of Italian.

In later years, when he had to correspond with Consalvi and other Roman Cardinals and dignitaries, his linguistic attainments gave him considerable power. He also had great advantages when dealing with Catholic affairs in England. He was a close friend of Bishop Gibson, of the Northern District, then Senior Vicar Apostolic, who had been his president for nine years at Douay; and he was also well known to the other Bishops, while many of the clergy in the South, and some also in the North, had been his pupils at Douay or Old Hall. His devotion to the old Catholic families was well known, and his work, first as vice president, subsequently as president of St. Edmund's College, kept him in touch with many of the most prominent of them, for in those days a large proportion of the Catholic aristocracy sent their sons to be educated at Old Hall. Dr. Poynter always won the respect of the parents, and the troubles due to mismanagement which occurred at the college during the first decade of the century, culminating in the rebellion among the students in 1809, they always attributed—and not without reason—to his frequent and long-continued absences, rendered inevitable by his double position. His courteous manner and unflinching tact always stood him in good stead, and when afterwards thrown into the midst of public affairs, he was able to deal with them far more easily than might have been expected from one who had lived so long within the walls of a college.

"But during the early years of his episcopate his chief work consisted in winning the respect and affection of the leading laymen and by the quiet, unobtrusive influence of his personality helping to break down the unfortunate barrier between the Bishops and the laity, which had been set up by the regrettable events which centred round the passing of the Relief Act of 1791.

"Milner, on the other hand, had a varied and difficult work before him. He was thrown into the very midst of his enemies. The Mirland District was notorious as the centre of that 'liberal' form of Catholicism which produced the group of priests known as the 'Staffordshire Clergy.' They could not but regard his advent as their Bishop with apprehension. It is creditable both to Milner himself and to the Midland clergy that the state of tension lasted only a short time. The death of the Rev. John Carter, which had taken place a few weeks before, removed the chief leader of disaffection—the only one, in fact, still residing in the Midland District who had not made a proper apology to his Bishop. Writing to Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, within a month of his consecration, Milner bears witness to the reception which had been accorded to him. 'Instead of experiencing that violent opposition which was generally expected by my friends,' he wrote, 'I find all the clergy and laity with whom I have hitherto had any concerns as respectful and submissive as I could wish them to be.'¹³ The fact is that those who came into contact with him soon learned to appreciate his great qualities and conceived an admiration for him, the tradition of which has lasted down to our own day. Over and above the work in his own district, Milner was concerned with various questions bearing on the welfare of the Church in England in which he took a prominent part. . . . It might have been hoped that the more responsible position in which he was now placed would have caused him to moderate the habitual harshness of his language and the severity of his judgments. It does not appear, however, that such was the case, and as a consequence, throughout Milner's long episcopate, the Midland District¹⁴ was as isolated from the other three as it was in the times of his two predecessors, Bishops Thomas Talbot and Charles Berington, though for a precisely opposite reason. Formerly the Bishops and clergy had been accused of lax principles bordering on unorthodoxy; henceforth the isolation was due to intolerance on the side of strictness."¹⁵ It is regrettable to be obliged to state, but it is nevertheless undeniable that Milner had, by dint of his powerful personality and efforts, literally thrust

¹³ Letter in Dublin archiepiscopal archives.

¹⁴ It must be remembered that England at the time in question was divided into "districts," and not, as now, into dioceses.

¹⁵ "The Eve of Catholic Emancipation," Vol. I., pp. 20, 21.

himself into the ranks of the English episcopacy. There is no reason for assuming that in doing so he was animated by any unworthy motives. He was perfectly convinced that he alone was capable of averting dangers which he believed threatened religion in England. That he was partly right in this belief seems possible. At any rate, he had his belief, and was no way reticent in expressing it or shy about acting on it. Indeed, Mgr. Ward quotes a letter of his, dated from Winchester, October 26, 1802, to the British Government agent in Rome, Sir John Coxe Hippisley, the contents of which, if known by the Pope, would probably have prevented his ever being elevated to the episcopal office. In this document he actually threatened to abandon the sacred ministry unless he was made a Bishop!

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE MANRIQUES, BATTLE-LORDS AND POETS.

THE story of the Manriques is a golden page from the book of heroic Spain; it is the compendium of all that chivalry and knighthood, that full flowering of the most manly civilization of Europe, when the grand qualities of the pagan seemed to join all that was most noble and beautiful in the Christian heart. From the half-legendary lords of Lara and the times of primitive chronicles, the Manriques descend from the eldest son of Pedro Gonzales Manrique de Lara, who married Ermessinda, Vicountess of Narbonne, and fell in battle in 1164. They ally themselves adown the centuries with the most powerful and distinguished; their name and prowess are everywhere in the annals of those hardy ages before the great nobles succumbed to the absolute rule of Hapsburg and Bourbon; they are doughty warriors and statesmen of the mailed hand in the turbulent days of the Enriques and Juans; they are Primates and Archbishops of Compostela and Sevilla; scholars and poets, collectors of books, patrons of learning and art; grand masters of knightly orders, courtiers and troubadours under royal balconies; allied with royalties of Castile and Aragon, lords of Molina and Amusco, counts of Morata de Paredes, marquises of Aguilar, Sotomayors, Portocarreros and Mendozas, with priests, and saints and cloistresses of their blood to guard their mortuary shrines.

With the death of Enrique *el doliente*, "The Sickly," husband of Catherine of Lancaster and champion of the anti-Pope Benedict XIII., the troubled throne of Castile passed in 1406 into the beau-

tiful, but helpless, hands of Juan II. With the departure from the scene of the foolish queen-mother there appeared the young favorite, Alvaro de Luna, the King's playmate from childhood, a character too great and fine for the age in which he lived. The King was content to lie upon silken cushions hearing the wandering poets and musicians, polishing his own writings according to the laws of *cortesía* and *mesura*, ordaining jousts of knights and courts of love and culture. Two hundred poets came and went, and swarms of minstrels and artists in gold and weaving, while the Castile fell deeper and deeper into confusion, and the great nobles warred among themselves like independent princes. For thirty years the young Don Alvaro struggled to maintain and extend the royal power, the one cool head among the feasters of the court, the most serious, the most powerful, the most hated in the land. Among the sturdiest of his enemies appears Don Pedro Manrique, eighth Lord of Amusco, at the head of a formidable faction, resolved to strip this young upstart from Aragon of his state and control; but Don Alvaro succeeded after a violent capture in casting him into prison, whence he emerged in 1449, only to die in the midst of a revulsion of feeling in his favor, when the court of the fickle Juan went into mourning, and Count Haro entered into the royal presence leading Don Pedro's two sons, Rodrigo and Gomez, and obtained the restoration of their family estates and dignities.

It is with these sons and with Jorge Manrique, the panegyrist of his father, Rodrigo, that we are principally concerned in a study of this typical great family of the fifteenth century. Gomez has won a glory of his own in letters as well as in the councils and factions of his time. Rodrigo, for all his power and great virtues, lives in vicarious fame through the great elegy written on his death.

Born in 1412, Rodrigo, Count of Paredes, early took his place in the ranks of the warriors of his family; he is a typical example of the hardy captains of a century when whole lives were spent in the saddle and council of war. He had accompanied his father in the campaigns against Don Alvaro, and, later, was an active leader in the factions that convulsed Castile and ended only in the triumph of the nobles over the royal favorite and his death upon the scaffold in 1453. Don Rodrigo also distinguished himself against the Moors and won special glory in capturing their city of Huescar, in Granada. He is also said to have found time to compose poetry; and in the words of his son:

Then for the prudence of his ways,
For merit, and in high award
Of service knightly,
His dignity they came to raise
Till he was Master of the Sword
Elected rightly.

As the powerful Grand Master of Santiago his state became practically royal, until his death in 1476 at Uclés, where he was entombed in the Capilla Mayor, according to Mariana ("Historia General de España," Vol. XII., page 322), although his son has written that he died at Ocaña.

The younger brother, Gomez, Lord of Villazopeque, was born in 1413, and educated under the influence of his uncle, Mendoza, the great Marquis of Santillana. He early took his place among the most elegant *trovadores* and court poets of Juan II. From these voluptuous surroundings he was called away by his sterner brother to take his part in warring on the Moors of Huescar, where he is said to have borne himself with gallantry. Henceforth his career is one of wounds and honors, riches and cares of state, and we find him holding a seat in the royal council and acting as *corregidor* and *alcalde* of the citadel of Toledo. His "Coplas de Mal gobierno de Toledo" ("Stanzas on the Bad Government of Toledo") have therefore particular point as a satire on the discords of the reign of the miserable Enrique "The Impotent," who had succeeded Juan II., and even eclipsed that monarch in futility. Gomez was not without humor, in spite of the strong moralistic leaning of some of his poems in the "Cancionero General" (nuevamente añadido, Toledo, 1520), and in his eighteen stanzas of *arte menor* we see much of the man and his times, even if he is not at his best as a poet:

When mighty Rome was conqueror,
 'Twas Scipio led the van of fighting;
 Old Fabius was her counsellor,
 And Titus Livius did her writing;
 And not a maid or wife but came
 And stripped the ornaments upon her,
 To offer them for warlike fame
 And save her country from dishonor.

Where none there be to rule the town
 How soon its triumphing is ended!
 How soon the rooftree tumbles down
 Where not a dweller is attended!
 If pigs without the dogs to herd
 Will straggle quick to their perdition,
 Can troops without a captain's word
 Be ever brought to war condition?
 The sheep without a shepherd's rod
 Will lay in waste both field and garden;
 The monks that own no prior's nod
 Will fall to sins beyond a pardon.
 The vineyards left unwatched to grow
 Unto each passer-by will yield them;
 The courts where gallants never show
 Are hands that have no gloves to shield them.
 The shoe that fares without a sole
 Can ill preserve the feet that wear it;
 The strings escaped the lute's control
 Will make a sound—if you can bear it.
 The church that boasts no lettered throng,
 A palace without walls, must tremble;
 Who looks for fish both big and strong
 Save where the firmest nets dissemble?

In falth that blow meseemeth light
Of which a swordless hand is giver;
But a sword without a hand of might—
Full litle thrust will it deliver!

Sometimes Gomez writes in the old manner as above, and again he shows his sympathy with the Italian innovations that his uncle, Santillana, had introduced. It is not unappropriate, therefore, that he should have employed a symbolism almost Dantesque in 1458 for his elegy on the death of the learned marquis. On the other hand, he has left some lines in Portuguese replying to one Don Alvaro; and the style and conventions of the Galician troubadours are evident in such poems as "The Battle of Loves," "The Seven Deadly Sins" and "The Pursuit of Vices and Virtues." In his works we find traces of the various influences that resulted in the tremendous masterpiece of his nephew, "The Stanzas;" he writes an exquisite lament in the Italian manner over the death of the poet Garcilasco de La Vega, and lines to his wife, Juana de Mendoza, portraying in graphic and beautiful figures the fleeting of life and the sharp stroke of the hand of death.

Gomez Manrique took a prominent part in every line of artistic endeavor; he was considered one of the greatest orators in a day when courts were swayed by eloquent discourses in the manner of the Romans and battlefields beheld contests of lordly tongues as well as of weapons hand to hand. ("Hist. Crit. de la Lit. Española," Vol. VII., page 115.) He figures also in the early history of the stage, as his "Representacion del Nacimiento de Nuestro Señor" is the first successor of the "Misterio de los Reyes Magos." His work is a kind of drama in twenty octosyllabic stanzas; the different characters are the Virgin Mary, St. Joseph and the Angels Gabriel, Michael and Raphael, as well as the shepherds of Bethlehem. It closes with a cradle song, and, from the presence of an *estribillo*, or refrain, at the end of each stanza, the work must come under the head of primitive opera as well as of the drama. It was composed and performed in the convent of Calabazano, where his sister was ruling as abbess. There is also another play from his pen, written to celebrate the birthday of the hapless Don Alfonso, who was substituted for his brother, the helpless Enrique IV., but died shortly after of poison. In this play the Infanta Isabel the Catholic appeared as one of the muses.

The importance of Gomez Manrique in early lyrical as well as satirical poetry is recognized more and more by the Spanish critics, since, aside from the intrinsic merit and simple manly charm of his own poems, he represents a point of convergence of the three great fountain heads of Spanish literature, viz., the florid elegance of the old Latin stock of the Senecas, Martial and Quintilian; the

Arab sententiousness and didactic quality as it appeared in the rhyme of his famous kinsman, Lopez de Ayala, and the culture of the Italian renaissance for which his uncle, Inigo Lopez de Mendoza, Marques de Santillana, was standing sponsor. Hitherto his importance has been largely measured according as he influenced the style of his nephew, Jorge, whose "Coplas" or "Stanzas" are still the greatest glory not only of the Manriques, but of the letters of the fifteenth century. Gomez survived both his martial brother, Rodrigo, the Grand Master of Santiago, and Jorge, and died in 1491, at the ripe age of eighty-two, after having commanded his tomb of alabaster beside his spouse, Doña Juana de Mendoza, in the Church of Santa Clara de Calabanzos.

Born in a home that is said to have been a complete school of the arts and sciences of the time, Jorge Manrique, Lord of Belmontejo, was the fourth son of Doña Mencía de Figueroa and Rodrigo, the Grand Master, whose death he was to sing in the unrivaled "Stanzas." The date of his birth is fixed about 1440, and he could hardly have more than "lisped numbers" when he also was plunged into the maelstrom of war and political intrigue. He followed the party of Don Alfonso, to whom the throne was offered in 1465, the unhappy prince rewarding him with the revenues of Villafruela, the escort of seven lances and the commandery of Montizon of the Order of Santiago. He joined his cousins, the Estúñgas, in warring on the priorate of San Juan, which was held by Juan de Valenzuela, the favorite of the dethroned Enrique, and succeeded in substituting Alvaro de Estúñiga as prior. After Enrique's death he was elected Trece of the Order of Santiago, a post of high honor and responsibility, when in 1475 he was called upon to defend the throne of Isabella the Catholic against the invasion of the rival claimant, the gallant Alfonso of Portugal. Jorge Manrique met the famous Marquis de Villena on the field of Calatrava, forcing him to retire and deliver over the Castle of Uclés in 1476. The Marquis persisting in his rebellion, Manrique and Pedro Ruiz de Alarcon were sent out to subdue him; on March 27, 1479, Manrique engaged him in battle before the gates of Garcimuno, and placed himself with such recklessness in the midst of his enemies that his followers lost sight of him. He received numerous wounds and died fighting, his sword in his hand. They carried the corpse to the town of Uclés and laid it in the old church of Santiago; in preparing him for the tomb they found hidden in his breast these *coplas* he had been composing "against the world:"

O World that givest and destroyest,
Would that the newer life alone
Were all of living!
For here, as good or ill deployest,
The parting is with gladness known

Or with misgiving.
 Thy paths are so with griefs encumbered,
 With sighing every breeze so steeped,
 With wrongs so crowded—
 A desert where no boon is numbered,
 Its sweetness and seduction reaped,
 And black and shrouded.
 Thy highway is the road of weeping;
 Thy long farewells are bitterness
 Without a morrow,
 Where down its ruts and ditches keeping
 The travcler who doth most possess
 Hath most of sorrow.
 Thy chattels are but had with sighing;
 With sweat of brow alone obtained
 The wage they give;
 In myriads thine ills come hieing,
 And once existence they have gained
 They longest live.

It is in such lines as these—typical of the warrior poet, although the late master critic, Menendez y Pelayo, omits them from his authorized text of "The Stanzas"—that we discover the true spirit of the fifteenth century, its nobility of purpose, the corruption in its high places and the pathos of its common life following upon the civil wars. Heaven seemed more than ever a place of refuge for the believing soul, a relief from a world unusually dark and troubled, with cities depopulated, roads gone to ditches and journeys unreturning and oblivious. Not that Jorge Manrique was always the stern moralist we find him in "The Stanzas;" as the favorite of his uncle, Gomez, he naturally took his place among the imitators of the Galician troubadours, and deeply enamored of his bride, Doña Guiomar de Meneses, he composed in her praise many *canciones* and *desires*—songs and conceits—as well as other poems grave and gay, which show the poet of "The Stanzas" in the process of development. Thus his little lament, "Quien no estuviese en presencia," takes new interest:

Let him whose time hath come to go
 Put never faith where he must part;
 Forgetful and change of heart
 Are penalties the absent know.
 You would be loved—a lover you?—
 Then pay your court incessant there,
 For hardly have you vanished ere
 Remembrance goes as lightly, too.
 Then off with idle hope, and start
 Let him whose time hath come to go;
 Forgetfulness and change of heart
 Are penalties the absent know.

If his works of humor seem light and thin, and the satire on his stepmother without the dignity that marks his references to his enemies in the course of "The Stanzas," Jorge Manrique is ever the man of rank and culture of his period. Since Alfonso X. the Wise had set the example, every courtier and warrior of Spain had become something of a poet or a chronicler, alternating from the Galician, Portuguese or Limousin to the Castilian newly

consecrated into literary preëminence by the bookish monarch's mandate. Such was the state of letters when in 1476 Jorge's father, the Grand Master Rodrigo, passed away at the summit of his earthly honors and powers. The sight of this catafalque laden down with all that fame, achievement and affection could afford struck the poet's heart with a vast sense of the futility of earthly hopes, and he broke forth into a chant of such solemn grandeur, such honest, manly pathos, that with one step he took his place at the head of the poets of his century and among the greatest singers of the world and time. He was but thirty-six years of age when he turned from literary trifling to write "The Stanzas," which Lope de Vega declares "should be inscribed in letters of pure gold"—the world's greatest poem of grief and consolation. Opening with wisdom and lamentation from out the ages, it rolls on with the lordly obsequies of the old religion, unfolding the ghostly pageantries of kings, the filial pride and weeping of lonely hearthstones, until the hand of faith is laid upon the bowed shoulders, and there comes the modulation of the pain, a gathering springtime of hope, the fulness of peace, and at last a far symphony of angelic harps. Again in vision five centuries later we see the banners wave from the castle rock of Ocaña; the voice of the serf and freeman comes over the fresh furrows on the hills of morn; though in the valley church of Uclés the dust gathers softly on the tomb of Don Rodrigo, the Grand Master, and Jorge Manrique, his poet.

It was still an age of poets and lamentations such as the old chronicler Sanchez de Tobar describes at the burial of the King Don Sancho in the thirteenth century, when "Don Nuño Gonzalez and all the gentry and people of Toledo made very great lamentation, and you or any other man could not think how great it was. And the Archbishop Don Gonzalo, with all the clergy, and with the priestly knights and all the nobles, took the body on the same day in the morning, and they carried it to the Church of Santa Maria in Toledo, and the Infante Don Enrique and Don Nuño, with the Queen, made very great lamentation. And the Archbishop straightway said Mass, and when it was finished they interred the body in a stone monument which he had ordered to be made during his lifetime." It was from some such obsequies that Jorge Manrique gathered the thoughts embodied in his "Stanzas" on his father's death:

I turn me from the praise and singing
Of panegyrists and the proud
Old poets' stories;
I would not have them hither bringing
Their artful potions that but cloud
His honest glories.

His faith and trust in God alone are real consolations for his

grief, but meditation on the worthlessness of earthly goods is put forward in mitigation of the human dread of death. The sense of the actual in his illustrations cannot have been unconscious, for we see again his impatience with empty formulas when he writes:

Recount no more of Troy or foeman
The echo of whose wars is now
But far tradition;
Recount no more how fared the Roman
(His scroll of glories we allow),
Nor his perdition;
Nor here rehearse the homely fable
Of such as yielded up their sway
These decades gone;
But let us say what lamentable
Fate the lords of yesterday
Have fallen upon.

Just as the old kings and their offspring had fared in the past, so with the new royal line:

The Visigoths whose lineage kingly,
Whose feats of war and mighty reign
Were so exalted—
What divers ways did all and singly
Drop down to the obscure again
And were defaulted!
Some through their worthlessness (How lowly
And base among the rabble came
Their estimation!)
Whilst others, as a refuge solely,
In offices they only shame
Maintain their station.

He asks, after the fashion of Francis Villon, his contemporary (1431-1489), of the fate of the weak and luxurious monarch he had served in his youth, Juan II.:

His jousts and tourneys where they vaunted
With trappings, and caparison,
And armor sheathing—
Were they but phantasies that taunted—
But blades of grass that vanished on
A summer's breathing?
What of the dames of birth and station,
Their head-attire, their sweeping trains,
Their vesture scented?
What of the gallant conflagration
They made of lovers' hearts whose pains
Were uncontented?
And what of him that troubadour
Whose melting lutaney and rime
Made all their pleasure?
Ah, what of her who danced demure,
And trailed her robes of olden time
So fair a measure?

Of the King Don Enrique IV. he tells us a further story, of luxury on its way into the grave, of the high promise of his reign, that ended only in his deposition and personal degradation:

His golden bounties without stinting,
The strongholds and the lairs of kings
With treasure glutted;
The flagons of their wassail glistening,
The sceptre's orbs, and crowns, and rings
With which they strutted;

The steeds, the spurs, the hits to rein them,
 The pillions draped unto the ground
 Beneath their paces—
 Ah, whither must we fare to gain them—
 That were but as the dews around
 The meadow places!

His archenemy, whom he had attacked bitterly enough, both in the field and with the pen, is now the object only of sympathy and pathos:

And then Don Alvaro, Grand-Master
 And Constable, whom we have known
 When loved and dreaded—
 What need to tell of his disaster
 Since we behold him overthrown
 And swift heheaded?
 His treasures that defied accounting,
 His manors, and his feudal lands,
 And boundless power—
 What more than tears were their amounting?
 What more than bonds to tie his hands
 At life's last hour?

The litany of desolation rolls along with the names of princes, grand masters and notables:

And what of all their power and prize
 That touched the very peaks of fame
 That none could limit?—
 A conflagration 'gainst the skies
 Till at its brightest ruthlessness came
 Death's hand to dim it.
 Their followers' unnumbered hosting
 The pennon and the battle-flag
 And bannered splendor?
 The castles with their turrets boasting,
 Their walls and harricades that brag
 And mock surrender?
 The cavern's ancient crypt of hiding,
 The secret passage, vault, or stair—
 What use affords it?
 Since thou, upon thy onslaught striding,
 Canst send, O Death, an arrow where
 No huckler wards it!

But idle pomp and worldly precaution are not all that must fail the mortal; even the glory of true knighthood and noble service on earth are hardly of more avail. The poet describes the virtues and successes of the Grand Master, his struggles against adverse fortune and the honest merit through which he won his way:

He left no weighty chests of treasure
 Nor hardly unto wealth attained
 Nor store excelling;
 To fight the Moors was all his pleasure,
 And thus his fortresses he gained,
 Demeasne and dwelling,
 With feats so mighty that Hispania
 Can never make account of all
 In numbers mortal—
 Till to his township of Ocafia
 Came Death at last to strike and call
 Against his portal:
 "Good Cavalier," he cried, "divest you
 Of all this hollow world of lies
 And soft devices;
 Let your old courage now attest you,
 And show a breast of steel that vies
 In this hard crisis."

Death goes on to explain to him that only half the terrors and pains are for those whose lives on earth have been dutiful, delivering a forceful presentation of the problem of mortality as it appears from the other side of the grave. Then, with a brusqueness that seems as if it might be biographical, the sturdy Grand Master addresses the terrible visitant:

Waste we not here the final hours
 This puny life can now afford
 My mortal being;
 But let my will in all its powers
 Conformable approach the Lord
 And His decreeing.
 Unto my death I yield—contenting
 My soul to put the body by
 In peace and gladness;
 The thought of man to live, preventing
 God's loving will that he should die,
 Is only madness.
 And thus, his hopes so nobly founded,
 His senses clear and unimpaired
 So none could doubt him—
 With spouse and offspring fond surrounded,
 His kinsmen, and his servants bared
 And kneeling 'round him—
 He gave his soul to Him who gave it
 (May God in heaven ordain it place
 And share of glory!)
 And left our life, as balm to save it,
 And dry the tears upon our face,
 His deathless story.

It was so they lived and died in the old days in Spain, breaking a final lance with the dread Rider on the White Horse, a proudly humble challenge of their lips. It was not until Louis XIV., and in another land, that men learned how to pass into eternity with a *bon-mot* and die in the manner of Versailles. The passages we have translated show as well as may be in another tongue the qualities and verse arrangement of the original, which needs no encomium, even should it not possess as large a renown in English as it deserves.

Of the Manriques little more remains to be said beyond what is contained in the proudest pages of old Spanish genealogies and annals of Church and State. The famous name of Manrique de Lara again occurred in the literature of the seventeenth century, when Luisa Magdalena, Countess of Paredes, acted as instructress for the Infanta Maria Teresa, who later became Queen of France. This descendant of Don Rodrigo and Jorge Manrique completes the tryptich of warrior, poet and saint that constitutes the history of every great family of Spain; for entering the rigid cloister of the Discalced Carmelites of Malagón she became famous for her virtues, as well as for poems, under the name of Madre Luisa Magdalena de Jesus, her literary masterpiece being "El Año Santo," or "Meditations for Every Day of the Year, Morning, Noon and Night" (Madrid, 1658), a work that earned the praises of Juan

Palafrox, editor of St. Teresa's letters. She has the great literary distinction of figuring in the "Catalogue of the Authorities of the Spanish Language," and she seems a not unworthy *Amen* to the great litany of the Manriques.

THOMAS WALSH.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THROUGH THE WEST INDIES TO THE PANAMA CANAL.

A VAST array of illustrious names emblazons the escutcheon of the Roman peninsula, and there can be no question that long after the division and subdivision of every nation now extant, in the distant cycle that has yet to pierce the horizon of to-morrow, these characters shall still invest the seat of learning, the hall of legislation, the harbor and the mart of commerce. Standing out in high relief, a giant amidst a lilliputian band, there shall be found a Titan of colossal size, one whose intrepidity gave to the world a mighty continent destined to change the routes of all the seas, the chronologies and conditions of every race beneath the cerulescent dome on high—Cristoforo Colombo, Commodore Captain of the Spanish Main. What that fearless sailor and his one hundred and twenty able seamen endured in braving the passage across the tremendous breadth of the Atlantic seas in caravels thrice the length of a modern lifeboat is known only to those whose wanderlust has taken them through tropical waters during the turbulent days of autumn; and the tourist who is fortunate enough to spend two months among our friends of the Southland is generous in his plaudits of the dauntless Genoese. The itinerary embraced visits to the Crescent Isle, over the hills and vales of fair Jamaica, up the Magdalena to the tip-top of South America, across the heights of Costa Rica, and along that great work of the American engineer—the Panama Canal.

In the afternoon of the fourth day the binoculars discerned the outlines of the Cuban coast, and the following morning all hands were up at sunrise to view the passage of the narrow strait connecting the placid waters of Havana Bay with the vast and buoyant Gulf of Mexico. To the left we beheld the giant lighthouse whose glowing beacon has flashed forth its warning message to generations of storm-tossed mariners; to the rear the grim walls of Morro Castle rose in sombre impotence, for the citadel has played its part and now peacefully sends across the deep the mystic symbols to those afloat. The harbor is a commodious basin, but until recently

was so shallow that the larger vessels anchored in midstream to load and unload their cargoes. This reproach has been partly removed, and immense improvements along the docks will enable the deepest ships to cast their hawsers to modern piers. Havana of to-day bears but slight resemblance to the city of years gone by. Able American engineers have transformed the ancient capital into a place of health and beauty, and the residents now boast a driveway and promenade that has no superior, the magnificent Malecon, signifying a seawall, which extends for miles along the curving shore of the Mexican Gulf. On Sunday afternoon those who appear on the pages of "Cuba's Who's Who"—as well as those of lesser station—drive up and down and then around Malecon and Prado in countless carriages, automobiles and equipages of every make and age. It is a moving panorama worth traveling many leagues to view. Visitors seem transported to a miniature Boulevard des Italiens as they note the carefree throngs that eat, drink and make merry in the brilliant cafés and places of amusement along the broad and handsome Prado when the shades of eventide have been drawn across the "Paris of the Indies." Streets in the old section are exceedingly narrow (twenty-six feet from wall to wall), steps of the trolleys reaching over the seven-foot sidewalks in the Calle San Luis Obispo, Calle O'Reilly and other thoroughfares catering to the wants of American travelers. The famous Cathedral in which the body of Columbus reposed after being brought from Santo Domingo, and prior to its transfer to Spain, is a great point of interest. It is sad to relate that the edifice requires a complete renovation within and without its sacred walls. The metropolis contains several modern office buildings, which appear like skyscrapers from the little streets below, and the mansions of the wealthy, especially along the Malecon, are homes of splendor. On the other hand, the one-story dwellings of the working classes are devoid of ornamentation, the iron-barred windows giving them the appearance of penal institutions. The national breakfast is very light, consisting merely of coffee and rolls; and it dissipates an erroneous impression by stating that smoking is strictly confined to men and the lower grades of women. It may be of interest to know that the first railroad bed was laid down here as early as 1834, the tracks now traversing 2,200 miles through the various Provinces, the Havana Central being driven by electricity; an old-fashioned railway station has been supplanted by a beautiful terminal that would be an ornament to any municipality. A three-hour siesta at midday was the accepted routine until the stranger from northern climes decided that such sinful waste should be changed to the American system of one hour for refreshments. The natives as a

class cannot be called homogeneous, the blood coursing through their veins being an admixture of Negro and Spanish, although there are many full-bloods of both races. Spanish merchants control the trade of the city and American residents are numerous enough to support two daily newspapers. The Metropolitan See of Santiago, 530 miles east of Havana, was established as a bishopric by His Holiness Pope Adrian VI. in the year 1522. Augustinian Fathers from Villanova, Pa., are doing good work in St. Augustine's College, where many youths are being carefully trained according to the rules of these well-known educators. The State also conducts the University of Havana, founded by the Jesuits 225 years ago as the College of San Ambrosio. The population of the city has grown since its occupation in 1519 to some 300,000 souls to-day and that of the island to 2,100,000, with an area of 45,000 square miles, or somewhat smaller than England. Transmarine commerce is enormous, last year reaching \$230,000,000. Sugar production runs to fabulous figures, about four billion pounds annually. Exports are mainly sugar and tobacco. Manufactures, excepting tobacco products, are almost unknown, with the result that clothing and articles of family use are higher than in the States. Small cigar factories are numerous and employ thousands of men and women, boys and girls. The tourist should remember that the metropolis is an expensive community; indeed the rates at one hotel are not less than \$25 per day for a suite of rooms. Clergy and literati have never been known to overtax the capacity of this aristocratic caravansary. Street car service is good and cabs may be hired at twenty cents per ride for any distance within the city limits. Havana has its plaza and fine municipal band, but for some unknown reason it is lacking in the principal institution of a Spanish-American city, a national opera house. However, in order to make amends in this direction, the Government recently ordered the construction of a magnificent building wherein to conduct the affairs of state.

The prevalent impression that Cuba is so unbearably hot that white men cannot withstand the terrific rays of the sun is far from being true, inasmuch as the cooling breezes that float perennially across the island go far to tempering the tropical heat. Within twenty miles of Central Park (the principal plaza) there may be seen a life as primitive as history records, with the exception that the adult aborigines deem a garment of some kind necessary to protect themselves from the heat, though the rising generation of señors and señoras are perfectly satisfied to wear a congenial smile. The huts are built of stout pine branches, the sides covered with cocoanut leaves and the roof of thatch; an iron-barred aperture acts

as a window and the ancient sod as a floor. Nature has been most generous to the Pearl of the Antilles, for three crops of table produce are usually secured. If the coast belt should prove too humid, there are pleasant spots on the imposing Sierra Maestra range, 8,000 feet above the level.

Morro's periodic gleam paled and paled as the blades warmed to the task of skirting the Isle of Pines before the rise of the effulgent orb of day, and then began the pleasant sail along the Caribbean Sea to the quaint and picturesque town of Montego Bay, on the northwestern coast of Jamaica. There is a vast difference between Jamaica and Cuba, for everything bespeaks the rule and customs of the English nation. Even the negroes, who comprise over ninety per cent. of the population, use a dialect germane to backwoods Georgia and that of Trafalgar Square. The island is nearly 150 miles in length and 35 in width. Things were not always as orderly as we find them to-day; the Spaniards raised their ensign in 1509, to be supplanted by the Union Jack in 1670, when Oliver Cromwell dispatched a fleet to this section for the purpose of exploitation. That noblest of all pirates, Sir Henry Morgan, and his fellow-buccaneers made the island their rendezvous while scouring the trade routes for game. Over two hundred years ago a tidal wave, caused by seismic shocks, swept high above Port Royal and sent it far below the surface of the sea. Seventeen million bunches of bananas make a pretty tidy crop for twelve months' work, and they keep many ships moving in and out of many harbors. Cocoanuts to the number of 21,000,000 and 50,000,000 oranges are annually sent to northern lands. Years ago rats devastated the sugar region to such a degree that the mongoose, a small animal of the rat species, was imported to destroy the rodents. It did most valiant work, but multiplied so enormously that the authorities are now at their wits' end looking for something to destroy the mongoose. An English garrison is located up in the cool of the mountains, while the native regiment has its headquarters near the capital. His Lordship the Governor General also dwells in regal style at King's House, five miles beyond the metropolitan limits, the beautiful gardens presenting every variety of flora known to the region. Vegetation is tropical, sub-tropical and temperate, making it possible to dine on rhubarb and celery, asparagus and cauliflower, strawberries and cranberries each and every day of the year. Heart disease is not a characteristic ailment of the aborigines; indeed, they take pains not to allow anything to perturb their equanimity—not even toil; for as soon as they acquire a few shillings they require a vacation long enough to properly disburse it all.

Montego Bay is perhaps the most archaic spot on the island. It is a fair-sized town of 10,000 people, and the quaintness of the place is greatly embellished by the picturesque habitations of the early Spanish settlers. Women display far more animation than men, driving carts, wheeling barrows, hawking long ropes of tobacco and smoking big black cigars with the *sang froid* of a veteran. The railway ride to Kingston, 140 miles distant, is filled with vistas of tropical enchantment. The road zigzags up the heights of the Blue Mountains, whose tallest pinnacle soars aloft 7,500 feet above the shore. In the ascent across the undulating hills and elevated tablelands, foaming cascades and canyons of profound depths the sunlit air begins to cool, light overcoats and wraps being finally brought into requisition. It has been said that Columbus, after traversing this tropical land in 1494, pronounced it an "island paradise;" and it has good reasons for being proud of the title, as the gorgeous landscapes would be difficult to equal, while the temperature is never excessive, due to the lively breezes common to the Caribbean Sea. The Government deserves much praise for its work in road building; one of these fine highways runs all around both coasts and is intersected by others at various points. Hotels of grandeur dot the little isle, with beautiful lawns running down to the rolling sea. These hostelries are mainly supported by rich Americans who follow the trail of the departing sun and bathe in summer seas when others are following the trail along the frozen path. Port Antonio, on the northern coast, is the centre of the banana trade. The town is ideally situated, and contains many "hotels" and at least one that is a real inn of great attraction. Much rivalry exists between "Antone" and the other watering places, all of which claim to possess merits far outshining their competitors.

Kingston, the capital, has a population of 60,000 and is so English that the dress suit is the irrevocable rule at the evening meal. Moreover, the domicile that can claim the slightest distinction in the way of a double gate or a ten-foot "lawn" bears the nomenclature of some noble house of Britain. Hence we find a modest little cottage, surrounded by a picket fence, styled "Marlborough Villa" or perhaps "Abercrombie Hall." Of course, there are residences of superior style and dignity, while stores are large and well-stocked. The principal market could readily be patterned after by our American municipalities, for it is large, airy and trim. The main business thoroughfare is wide and clean, and contains several buildings of importance. Trolleys take the tourist on many pleasant little trips to agreeable spots in the suburban sections. "Clarks" in the shops are generally colored women of the better grade, and those

less cultured sit cross-legged on the streets and hammer mortar off the bricks from the buildings which fell during the cataclysm of 1907, among them the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity. Bishop Collins, however, lost no time in securing funds for the erection of the present beautiful structure. Catholics are not numerous in the interior, for of the 900,000 people on the island, less than 20,000 profess the ancient faith, their spiritual needs being under the care of the Jesuits. St. George's College is also supervised by the sons of Loyola, and the Sisters conduct an academy for the education of young ladies. The principal hotel is a handsome structure, and has a fine view of the ocean front; there are also smaller places with comfortable quarters and reasonable terms. There is not the least doubt that the little black boys who cavort in and around the waters of the harbor take the palm at long-distance diving, floating and swimming. They reach their place of business early in the morning and remain throughout the day, even securing their meals from the kind-hearted stewards who fling hardtack, loaves and other eatables at their ebony heads. They catch every coin that comes within a reasonable radius, and dive far down into the depths for those they miss. If a sixpence should be cast too far afield, they scramble hand-over-hand to the spot and then disappear like so many lumps of coal. A few minutes later a little black face bubbles above the surface, with the cry, "Thank'ee, mister; t'row us a 'bob' dis time."

Puerto Colombia lies 400 miles due south of Kingston, and cannot claim to be an ideal harbor, as it faces an open roadstead and is so shallow that the English company owning the railroad to Barranquilla, the chief "seaport" of Colombia, was compelled to build a pier nearly a mile in length to enable ships to transfer their cargoes to the waiting freight cars. The place contains a few shacks called houses, the roofs of which are covered with thatch. Small children dwell close to nature, while their dark-skinned mothers bake the family bread in primitive ovens made of clay. Barranquilla, sixteen miles from the coast, is a modern city of fifty thousand inhabitants, and its fair-sized stores and rich-appearing residences betoken much prosperity. It is the terminus of the various steamboat lines running up the Magdalena River and also acts as the mart of exchange in connection with transmarine commerce. Everything is Spanish—religion, language and customs—but there is a good sprinkling of foreigners, especially Germans, who control the trade of the Republic. The sun shines with equatorial brilliancy when soaring to the meridian, and during the three-hour siesta *avenidas* and *calles* are as devoid of animation as Charing Cross, Champs Elysées, Unter den Linden or Broadway are alive with the nerve-racking now-or-never of the temperate

zone. Not a biped of any color, nor a quadruped of any species ventures beyond the little one-story, iron-barred, plastered habitations until the terrific heat of midday has been assuaged by the cooling zephyrs that wing across the city in the hours of diurnal decay. At the stroke of six the sunset gun sends forth its booming notes, and within an hour the Zocalo fills with the gay Lothario, embonpoint dueña and æsthetic señorita, for along the lengthy banks of the noble Magdalena, as in places not remote, the demoiselle who tips the beam beyond the ten-stone limit shatters all the ideals of refined society. Along the plaza they stroll and chat, the señors emitting great clouds of the noxious weed, the young ladies flashing glances of Andalusian hue. They are of every rank and every class, and judging from their loquacity and gesticulations, one and all are filled to overflowing with a store of knowledge somewhat more profound than an encyclopedia of unabridged dimensions. At nine o'clock the silver-throated chimes roll merrily above the lively throng, and lo! the promenaders avault like Banquo's spectre before the affrighted glare of Cawdor's Thane.

Bogotá, a capital of 110,000 inhabitants, reposes nearly nine thousand feet above the level, and the tourist must prepare for a long but interesting seven-day trip up the Magdalena, navigable for nearly 900 miles from its mouth, the fare being fifty-five dollars to or from the city of Barranquilla. River steamers are quite large and comfortable, but win no laurels at record-breaking. Alligators swarm by the million up and down the big stream, and the official figures state that 30,000 to 40,000 of these reptiles are yearly slaughtered for the export trade. After five days have elapsed the sightseer leaves the boat at La Dorado and proceeds to Beltran by rail. Once again he departs from terra firma and sails for Girardot, to once more entrain for Bogotá, fifty-two miles further. The break in the river journey at La Dorado is to overcome the difficulties of climbing the roaring falls immediately above that point. All this seems a cumbersome and ancient method of transportation; but the early travelers did not even have the accommodations we find at our disposal to-day. Within the last twenty years everything was hauled up the mountains on muleback—passengers as well as freight—and it should not be forgotten that Bogotá is nearly two miles above sea level. But the trip is worth while, for views that would require a page to describe are beheld at every twist of the roaring train. A prominent resident stated that the reason why the Spaniards went so far up the hilltops to found the capital was because they did not wish to be annoyed by invading armies. Their wish has been gratified to its completest fulfillment, for even Napoleon or Hannibal might balk at climbing those lofty

crag. Bogotá enjoys a glorious climate, the mercury generally hovering around 65 degrees; the nights, of course, are cool, sometimes cold. Surrounded by high mountain peaks, the tallest being the snow-capped Tolima, nearly 19,000 feet above the level, the metropolitan city is divided into four parts by the San Francisco and San Augustin Rivers, which are crossed by a score of bridges. Streets cross at right angles and are generally well paved and clean. An electric street car line, owned by the municipality, renders good service to the traveling public. The Avenida de la Republica is the principal thoroughfare, the Avenida de la Colon being a good second. Around the Plaza de la Constitucion are found the Federal buildings and the magnificent Corinthian Cathedral, services at the latter being well attended, for the ancient faith finds a responsive chord in the hearts of the Colombian people. Everything in the city bespeaks the Spaniard—customs and architecture. Some fine specimens of ancient Inca civilization are found in the Museum. The Observatory, conducted by the Jesuits, is of international repute, and the National University is turning out a group of young men whose talents should aid in the material and intellectual development of their country. Church and State are separate, but the Government supports religion, and education is supervised by the Bishops of the Catholic Church.

Pamphlets were being printed in the old capital as early as 1738, and it is said that not less than seventy-five periodicals of various kinds are regularly turned out in the metropolis. With an area of 450,000 square miles, the country supports a population of about 4,500,000, or about ten to a square mile, and when it is known that Colombia possesses almost every mineral from coal to emeralds, and that in great abundance, not to speak of every kind of climate from torrid to frigid, it brings home to us that the future of this most favored land should be one of enormous possibilities. Lack of communication and periodical revolutions have hampered the growth of the Republic in times gone by, but there is good reason for believing that a new era has dawned that will prove conducive to the well-being of what was formerly known as New Granada.

Before attempting a necessarily brief survey of the fifty-mile link that is destined to change the commercial routes of the whole civilized world, as well as to dim or illumine the prestige and affluence of many nations now of high and low degree, it should be known that the consummation of the Panama Canal is the dream of centuries and is coincident with Balboa's discovery of the Pacific in 1513. King, the able author of *Wonders of the World*, states that "In the town library of Nuremberg is preserved a globe, made by Johann Schöner in 1520. It is remarkable that the passage

through the Isthmus of Darien, so much sought after in later times, is on this globe carefully traced." The historian Gomera advocated the union of the oceans in 1550; and it has been recorded that the Dutch prepared plans for the same work upwards of two hundred years ago. The cutting through the waist of the earth was such a popular theme that the ubiquitous Munchausen consigned to paper a most remarkable and interesting prediction in 1786. It preceded Goethe's prophecy by a generation, and runs as follows:

"On our arrival at the Isthmus of Darien, sensible of what general benefit it would be to mankind, I immediately formed a plan of cutting a canal across the isthmus from sea to sea. For this purpose I drove my chariot with the greatest impetuosity repeatedly from shore to shore, in the same track, tearing up the rocks and earth thereby, and forming a tolerable bed for the water. Gog and Magog next advanced at the head of a million of people from the realm of North and South America, and from Europe, and with infinite labor cleared away the earth and rocks that I had plowed up with my chariot. I then again drove my chariot, making the canal wider and deeper, and ordered Gog and Magog to repeat their labor as before. The canal being a quarter of a mile broad and three hundred yards in depth, I thought it sufficient and immediately let in the waters of the sea. I did imagine that from the rotary motion of the earth on its axis from west to east, the sea would be higher on the eastern than the western coast, and that on the uniting of the two seas there would be a strong current from the east, and it happened just as I expected. The sea came in with tremendous magnificence, and enlarged the bonds of the canal, so as to make a passage of some miles broad from ocean to ocean, and make an island of South America. Several sail of trading vessels and men-of-war sailed through this new channel to the South Seas and China, and saluted me with all their cannon as they passed. Thus having wedded the Atlantic Ocean to the South Sea, I returned to England."

The Isthmus of Tehuantepec, at the extreme southern end of Mexico, was long favored by the Spaniards, and it is known that Cortés had a survey made about 1530 for a canal to link the Gulf with the Pacific. The isthmus at this point is 120 miles wide, and the project was held in abeyance and finally abandoned upon the completion of the railroad from Vera Cruz to Salina Cruz twenty-eight years ago. The Nicaraguan route had many adherents, and in 1889 the Nicaraguan Canal Company, an American concern, undertook the work of sailing ships from coast to coast via the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua, the latter being 110 feet above the level. This projected highway was to have been 170 miles in

length, of which 142 miles passed through the river and lake, leaving 28 miles to be excavated. Much money was expended in dredging, pier building and railway construction. The United States Commissioners estimated that \$130,000,000 would be required. Financial difficulties resulted in the liquidation of the company. Ferdinand de Lesseps, the able French engineer who supervised the construction of the Suez Canal, undertook the task of snapping the rock-ribbed strip binding the vast empires of the North and South. He had linked Orient with Occident in the remarkably short space of ten years and six months; but it will be recalled that the Suez route, although one hundred miles in length, passes through three lakes fifty-eight miles long. There was little blasting to be done, inasmuch as the earth was generally of a sandy nature; moreover, the highest elevation cut through did not exceed fifty feet above the level, nor is it as wide or deep as our isthmian channel. The Culebra Cut at Panama is about nine miles long and at one point the hill was 320 feet above the bed of the canal. De Lesseps was handicapped in many ways. In the first place, an engineering task of the greatest possible magnitude, through a tropical land where pestilential diseases abound, required much preliminary work in the way of sanitation prior to the inauguration of activities. Again, the surveys were not made along the most useful and economical lines, nor could such a gigantic project be successfully carried through without the backing of a powerful government. It should also be understood that the toylike machinery at the disposal of the engineer of twenty-five years ago was not to be compared with the mammoth engines, dredges, steam-shovels and other tools now at the command of our American diggers. After years of incapacity, mismanagement and pestilence, the French shareholders lost the large sum of \$300,000,000, and much of the costly machinery, valued at \$30,000,000, lay idle for twenty years and finally rusted into uselessness. It should be said, however, that Colonel George W. Goethals, the eminent chief engineer of the Canal Commission, has found available about 30,000,000 of the 78,000,000 cubic yards excavated by the Gallic workers.

After satisfactory arrangements were completed for the purchase of the French company's rights for \$40,000,000, negotiations with the Republic of Colombia were carried on to secure other necessary rights and privileges not held by the French company. After a long delay, a treaty was formulated, which was rejected by Colombia in 1903. The Province of Panama, an integral part of Colombia, thereupon seceded and organized an independent republic with an area of about 31,000 square miles and a population which at present is stated to be 419,000. This resulted in the negotiation of a satis-

factory treaty with the new Republic of Panama, including the payment, under certain terms, of \$10,000,000 by the United States to the Republic of Panama and an annual payment of \$250,000 beginning nine years after the signing of the treaty. Under this treaty the United States guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama and secured absolute control over what is now called the Canal Zone, a strip of land about ten miles in width, with the Canal through the centre, and forty-five miles in length from sea to sea, with an area of about 450 square miles. The total cost of the whole work will reach nearly \$400,000,000, and October 15, 1913, is the tentative date set for the passage of the first vessel. The formal opening, however, will occur January 1, 1915. The total excavation will reach 250,000,000 cubic yards.

It would require a volume of literature to convey a true conception of the magnitude of the isthmian span between the Caribbean's roll and the Pacific's swell, for it is undoubtedly the greatest work the dauntless engineer has as yet attempted in conquering problems that have baffled and defied the mind and muscle of man. The entire length of the Canal from deep water in the Atlantic to deep water in the Pacific is about fifty miles. Its length from shore line to shore line is about forty miles. In passing through it from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a vessel will enter the approach channel in Limon Bay, which will have a bottom width of 500 feet and extend to Gatun, a distance of about seven miles. At Gatun it will enter a series of three locks in flight, varying from 25 to 30 feet, and be lifted 85 feet to the level of Gatun Lake. The ship may steam at full speed through this lake, in a channel varying from 1,000 to 500 feet in width, for a distance of about 24 miles, to Bas Obispo, where it will enter the Culebra Cut. It will pass through the Cut, a distance of about nine miles, in a channel with a bottom width of 300 feet, to Pedro Miguel. There it will enter a lock and be lowered 30 feet to a small lake, at an elevation of 54 feet above sea level, and will pass through this for about one and a half miles to Miraflores. There it will enter two locks in series and be lowered to sea level, passing out into the Pacific through a channel about eight and one-half miles in length, with a bottom width of 500 feet. The depth of the approach channel on the Atlantic side, where the maximum tidal oscillation is over two feet, will be 41 feet at mean tide, and on the Pacific side, where the maximum oscillation is 21 feet, the depth will be 45 feet at mean tide.

Throughout the first 16 miles from Gatun, the width of the lake channel will be 1,000 feet, then for four miles it will be 800 feet and for four miles more, to the northern entrance to Culebra Cut

at Bas Obispo, it will be 500 feet. The depth will vary from 85 to 45 feet. The water level in the Cut will be that of the lake, the depth 45 feet and the bottom width of the channel 300 feet.

The lock gates will be steel structures 7 feet thick, 65 feet long and from 47 to 82 feet high. In the construction of the locks it is estimated that there will be used approximately 5,000,000 barrels of cement. Electricity will be used to tow all vessels into and through the locks and to operate all gates and valves, power being generated by water turbines from the head created by Gatun Lake. Vessels will not be permitted to enter or pass through the locks under their own power.

Three hundred feet is the minimum bottom width of the Canal. This width begins about half a mile above Pedro Miguel locks and extends about eight miles through Culebra Cut, with the exception that at all angles the channel is widened sufficiently to allow a thousand-foot vessel to make the turn. The Cut has eight angles, or about one to every mile. The water surface of the lake will be maintained during the rainy season at 87 feet above sea level, making the minimum channel depth in the Canal 47 feet. As navigation can be carried on with about 41 feet of water, there will be stored for dry season surplus over five feet of water. Making due allowance for evaporation, seepage, leakage at the gates and power consumption, this would be ample for 41 passages daily. The Suez Canal passes about 17 vessels per day, with a total yearly tonnage of 21,000,000. According to conservative calculations, the Canal as designed will have ample water supply for as many lockages per day as can be passed through the Canal, which is estimated to be 48 for the twin locks. This will amount to fully 80,000,000 tons per annum, or 15,000,000 greater than our entire foreign tonnage in 1911, and the Canal will not be called upon to take care of tonnage in excess of this amount until a very distant day. Should the time ever come when greater capacity is needed, other locks paralleling the present ones could be built, and the storage of additional water to carry over the dry season could be obtained from a dam at Alhajuela.

There are in use 100 steam-shovels that lift from one to five cubic yards of material at every dip; 315 locomotives; 560 drills; 4,346 cars; 19 pile-drivers; 20 dredges; 57 cranes; 12 tugboats; 70 barges; besides a hundred or more machines of every description. The number of men employed has averaged about 35,000, of whom 5,000 are Americans.

The United States Government has spent several million dollars in giving the Zone thorough sanitation and erected home and boarding houses for its army of diggers. The various "town sites" along

the route contain model homes for a tropical community. Everything is built above the ground, so as to allow the fresh air—and there is an abundance of it on the Isthmus—to invade the innermost recesses, while wire netting all around the verandas protects the sleeper during his nocturnal rest. The Government also operates the Commissary Department, where foodstuffs may be bought at twenty per cent. less than in the States. There are eighteen hotels along the line for white employees, at which good meals are served for thirty cents, the visitor paying half a dollar for the same service. At Panama the Government has erected a magnificent hotel, the Tivoli, where accommodations may be secured at reasonable rates. Climatic conditions are more favorable than many are wont to believe because of its nearness to the equator. The temperature ranges between 70 and 80 degrees, rarely climbing beyond 90. Rainfalls are frequent and heavy, the precipitation averaging 133 inches a year.

The engineers' calculations as to the sufficiency of the water supply have been amply vindicated. The great Gatun Lake accumulates weekly during the rainy season about five and one-half billion cubic feet of water. Every time a ship is locked through the Canal 5,500,000 cubic feet of water must pass, and when the lake is full it will afford enough water to fill the locks 150 times daily, which is at least twice as fast as the ships can pass. When the surface of the lake reaches its maximum height of eighty-seven feet above sea level, with the water just flowing over the crest of the dam, it will contain the enormous amount of 192,250,000,000 cubic feet of water.

The new route will bring Yokohama 1,500 miles closer to New York than to Liverpool, while Melbourne will be 1,000 and Sydney 1,800 miles nearer the metropolis. The New York captain bound for the South Seas can make Auckland in 8,550 miles, while the British skipper will require 11,350 for the voyage; and the trade of Australasia is worth seeking, for the 5,500,000 inhabitants of the Antipodes in 1911 imported merchandise valued at \$380,000,000, of which our share amounted to a paltry \$38,000,000, or ten per cent. of the sum total, the lion's share going to a far-away island in the North Atlantic Ocean.

The countries of the west coast of South America are on the alert for the opening of the new route, as it will mean immense opportunities for great commercial expansion because of decreased ocean transportation. The press of Chile, Peru and Bolivia considers the Canal the most important and far-reaching factor that has come up within the history of their respective republics. Railroads from Chile to Bolivia are extending and sending out feeders,

which in turn are reaching terminals of Bolivian railways and they in turn are connecting up the lines of Ecuador. The Governments of these three countries are giving every aid and facility to the extension of present lines and in every way favoring the laying down of new ones. Their commerce amounts to over \$350,000,000 annually, and can easily, with increased facilities of ocean transportation at decreased rates, be doubled.

Colonel Goethals is on record as saying that Panama is destined to become the greatest depot on the seas for the disposal of coal to needy ships. Some idea of the amount that will be needed by transient ships may be gained from the fact that the Canaries handle \$5,000,000 worth annually. England's coal exports aggregate about \$200,000,000, while in addition 20,000,000 tons are "shipped for the use of British steamers engaged in the foreign trade." It is expected that \$10,000,000 will not cover the oil and coal traffic at Panama.

The volume of trade now passing over the tracks of the Panama Railroad is nothing short of stupendous. This is shown by the number of ships arriving at the port of Colon during 1911, and it is regrettable to note that of the 700 vessels entered only a small percentage flew the Stars and Stripes. At present soundbound cargo is landed at Colon, sent by rail to Panama, and there transshipped to points on the western coast. The railroad was opened in 1855, and the fare for many years was \$25 across the Isthmus—over fifty cents per mile! The time of passage was four hours. The present fare is \$2.40 and time of transit two hours and a quarter. From 1853 to 1895, inclusive, the company paid dividends in stock and cash amounting to \$37,800,000, or over 600 per cent. and averaging a little less than fifteen per cent. per annum.

The pessimists, both at home and abroad, have placed the seal of doom on the greatest engineering feat of modern times, but the Canal will be in full operation in 1915, and what is more, its operation will be as successful and beneficial as the work of the Frenchmen at Suez. But American merchants cannot afford to be neglectful of the advantages and disadvantages presented to them by the work at Panama, and the words of Hon. John Barrett, Director of the Pan-American Union, and perhaps the greatest authority on Latin-American customs and commerce, are well worthy of consideration. Mr. Barrett recently returned from a tour of Europe and gave expression to the following remarks regarding the famous waterway:

"I am emphatic in saying that American manufacturers must wake up, and that speedily, if they are to hold the mastery of the Panama Canal trade against Europe. I looked into the ports, the

manufactories and exports in the big cities, and I am convinced that unless the people of the United States will wake up they will find the Europeans ready to assume the mastery in trade through the Canal. Business houses and manufacturers are getting ready on an enormous scale everywhere and are keeping alive for the opening of the Canal. The general field of Europe is far ahead of the United States and ahead of South America as a whole. Not only are the business men, shippers, exporters and shipbuilders of Europe humming with this activity, but the governments of Europe are doing the same thing."

The northbound "fruiters" find Port Limon a profitable port of call, for the banana crop is so great that two ships a day could readily be loaded to the line. Excepting on the southern entrance to the harbor, the town is at the mercy of the open sea. Docking facilities are above the ordinary, being built by a large American fruit company that practically controls the vast banana trade of the Republic. The principal object of interest that attracts the tourist is the loading of the countless thousands of green bananas that ascend from wharf to deck on an appliance constructed on the lines of a moving staircase. Two stevedores on the deck roll the large bunches to men below, and they in turn keep the fruit moving downward after the fashion of an endless chain. Forty thousand bunches are thus handled in the space of ten hours, with two gangs feeding the hatches fore and aft. The town itself is of little importance, for it is in the centre of the rain belt, which sometimes means an inundation copious enough to float a fair-sized battleship.

The railroad ride to San José is one of tropical and sub-tropical grandeur, the engine doing heavy drilling in its steep climb up and around the curving, twisting rails that lead to the metropolis, one hundred miles to the west. Six hours are required to make the ascent, for the city is five thousand feet above the level of the earth, and at a point nine miles distant the track reaches an altitude of six thousand feet. The seat of legislation is built on a level plateau, surrounded by undulating ridges, and the climatic conditions are most agreeable. Midday is never excessively hot and the nights are always cool enough for sheet and blanket. Being of Spanish blood, the Costa Ricans love music and song, so they spent a million and a half in the erection of the National Opera House, a theatre of regal magnificence, thus displaying great musical development on the part of 40,000 citizens of the capital of a little nation that claims a population of 400,000 souls. The building, illuminated by an enormous number of electric lights, is so arranged that the entire floor can be raised to one level for public and private functions. It was here that the lavish banquet and ball in honor of

Secretary Knox were held. The Cathedral, a noble edifice, stands alone and faces a beautiful zocalo, the Parque Morazan, wherein are to be found a thousand species of plant life. Although the bulk of the populace are of Spanish descent, the Bishop of the see is a German, the Right Rev. Gaspar Storck.

It is not hyperbole to say that there are but few cities of the same size that display more animation or progressiveness than we find in San José. Bananas and coffee have produced an élite second to none, and their sons and daughters are generally educated in the United States and Europe. One-story houses are the rule, and many of these are of adobe; but on the Calle Real there are handsome domiciles surrounded by tropical gardens. The town has its aristocratic suburbs, which are reached by the trolley line, and it is a peculiar fact that this bustling little metropolis boasts the only electric car service south of Mexico City in North America. Heavy shutters, iron bars and the grilles reminiscent of mediæval Spain, such as one sees in many old colonial towns of Central and South America, are conspicuous by their absence in San José. It will be recalled that Cartago was devastated by earth shocks early in 1910, when the Arbitration Palace built by Mr. Andrew Carnegie at a cost of \$250,000 was shaken down. The climate is healthy and fresh, and the residents deserve unbounded praise for their efforts to dig away the débris and erect a newer and finer city.

While less than five hundred miles of railway now handle the trade of Costa Rica, the day is not far distant when the three Americas will be linked by bonds of steel. It will take time to forge the heavy links uniting the South American continent with Hudson Bay; but things look bright for such a hopeful consummation in the way of annihilating time and developing the interior of all the countries concerned. The men behind this vast undertaking are connected with an American company which is interested in the commercial exploitation of Central America, where it holds great fruit plantation concessions. The cost of 535 miles of road now being operated by the company was approximately \$27,000,000, and the directors have authority to issue stock to the amount of \$70,000,000 if necessary to drive the road from Panama to the Mexican frontier. The completion of the plans of the International Railway will do much towards drawing the isthmian republics closer together and will do much in the way of eliminating revolutionary troubles and unrest.

WILLIAM S. LONG.

Camden, N. J.

A ROYAL PATRONESS OF LEARNING:

MARGARET BEAUFORT, MOTHER OF HENRY VII. OF ENGLAND.

AMONG the last, if not the last, of those noble women who have carried out in their lives the best ideals of the Middle Ages stands Margaret Beaufort, mother of King Henry VII. Of royal ancestry through her descent from Edward III., she was also the foundress of a royal family that occupied the throne of England for three hundred years. She was born May 31, 1441 (some authorities say 1443), at Bletsoe, in Bedfordshire, her mother being Margaret, only daughter and heiress of Sir John Beauchamp, of Bletsoe, and her father John Beaufort, first Duke of Somerset and grandson of John of Gaunt. He had taken a prominent part in the wars with France, in return for his great services being made Lieutenant of the Duchy of Aquitaine and Captain General of France and Normandy. In 1436 he returned to England, and soon after married the widow of Sir Oliver St. John. Their only child, the subject of this sketch, was destined to add new lustre to an already distinguished family. Possessed of ample means, Margaret's parents kept up at the various manors belonging to them, more especially at Bletsoe, the splendor customary to their rank. Her father died, however, while she was scarcely more than an infant. He had for some time been in disgrace at court, and it is stated by one of the chroniclers of Croyland that in consequence he took his own life, but this is not corroborated by other writers of the period. He was buried at Wimborne, in Dorsetshire, near which place, at Kingston Lacy, the family seems to have been living at this time; after his death the Duchess appears to have returned with her child to Bletsoe. In the fine manor house, built somewhat in the style of a castle, the little Margaret lived with her mother and two half-brothers, being brought up, as we are told, most carefully. It seems not unlikely that Margaret received the same training as the young St. Johns; she early showed signs of the great mental powers with which she had been endowed, and her education was far in advance of that usually given even to women of rank in her day. Probably an ecclesiastic attached to the household of the Duchess of Somerset as chaplain or confessor taught the young people of the family; this was a usual method of education among the upper classes at that time. It is known that she studied French with considerable success and Latin to a certain extent. In later life she was heard to regret that she had not in her youth made herself perfect mistress of that language, though

she appeared to have, as her saintly confessor, Bishop Fisher, says, "well understood the rubric of the ordinal for the saying of the service." Very shortly after her father's death, Margaret, who was one of the greatest heiresses in England, was put under the guardianship of the Duke of Suffolk, though because of her extreme youth she was apparently not removed from her mother's care. Suffolk was exceedingly anxious to secure her as a bride for his son; some authorities claim that the marriage actually took place when she was about nine years of age, though she did not ratify it when old enough to consent. In the meantime Henry VI. proposed a marriage between her and his half-brother, Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond. When his proposal was made known to Margaret, it was said that she "asked counsel of an old gentlewoman whom she much loved and trusted," who advised her to "commend herself to St. Nicholas, the patron and helper of all true maidens." Margaret acted upon the advice she had received, "specially that night when she should the morrow after make answer of her mind determinately . . . as she lay in prayer . . . whether waking or sleeping she could not assure; but about four of the clock in the morning one appeared unto her arrayed like a Bishop, and naming unto her Edmund, bade take him unto her husband." Bishop Fisher speaks of this dream being told to her "parents," so the Duchess must by this time have been married to her third husband, Lord Welles. Possibly Margaret was living near the court, after this marriage, under the guardianship of Suffolk. In any case, whether she was under her mother's care or not, the decision of this important matter seems to have been left largely to herself. She ended by choosing the bridegroom of her dream. In the meantime the Duke of Suffolk was accused of treason, and being attainted and banished, his lands and privileges were taken from him; among the latter was the guardianship of the Lady Margaret. Not long after the marriage of the young heiress and Edmund Tudor took place. No account of the ceremony or of Margaret's early life has come down to us. In fact, but for Bishop Fisher's funeral sermon and the various volumes of privy purse expenses of Henry VII. and his Queen, there would be almost no record of the life of this most interesting woman. There are, of course, full accounts of her foundations at the University of Cambridge. There, indeed, every allusion to her is cherished with an almost reverent interest. But in this period of transition in England, when printing had just been introduced, it was far too expensive to be used in recording the ordinary events of life. At the same time, clerks who wrote by hand found the new art superseding their own; their numbers, consequently, grew less year by year. Thus

from both causes we miss the full account of an interesting and important period. It was not until civil peace was restored by the union of the houses of York and Lancaster and the Tudor dynasty firmly established that the records grow complete, as under Henry VIII.

The union of the youthful Margaret with Edmund Tudor took place under the brightest auspices. To many there was a glamor about the son of Owen Tudor, with his reputed descent from the legendary Arthur Pendragon—Henry VII. bore a dragon as his device at Bosworth Field, an act which doubtless increased the enthusiasm of his Welsh followers. The royal birth of Henry's grandmother, that French Katherine, widow of Henry V., who married the gallant Owen Tudor, gave the family a unique position. Henry VI. on becoming King took the greatest interest in his half-brothers, Edmund and Jasper. He saw that they were "carefully educated under the most honest and virtuous ecclesiastics" and brought to court at a suitable age. The year after his brother's betrothal the King gave him the "county of Richmond, or Richmondshire, in the North Riding of York," making him an Earl and granting him in virtue of his near relationship to royalty the further privilege of sitting in Parliament next to dukes. Besides receiving other lesser lordships, he was "allowed to keep a chaplain, two esquires, two yeomen and two chamberlains."

A "noble mansion," Baynard's Castle, in London, which had been a residence of the Saxon kings, was also granted; we read of the young couple residing here at one time. Immediately after their marriage, however, they went to the Welsh estates of the Tudors, living principally at Pembroke Castle, in South Wales, the home of Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke, Edmund's younger brother. Here Margaret's only child, Henry, was born. The room in which the future king first saw the light was still in existence some year ago. Leland, the antiquary, says, "In the utter ward I saw the chaumbre where King Henri VII. was borne, in knowledge whereof a chimmeney is new made with the Armes and Badges of King Henri VII." It seems eminently fitting that the birthplace of one of England's greatest kings should be marked in same way; perhaps a "chimmeney new made" is the most appropriate memorial of one who gave his country an era of peace in which each man might enjoy the security of his own fireside—a privilege which certainly had not been his during the three previous reigns.

Margaret's happy married life soon came to an end, her husband dying on the feast of All Saints, 1456. He was buried in the church of the Grey Friars at Caermarthen. When his grandson, Henry VIII., suppressed the monastery, the remains were carried to St.

David's Cathedral and interred within the chancel. Here the following inscription may be read: "Under this marble stone, here enclosed, rest the bones of that noble lord, Edmund, Earl of Richmond, father and brother to kings; who departed out of this world in the year 1456, the first day of November. On whose soul Almighty Jesu have mercy."

Three years after the death of the Earl of Richmond, Margaret married her cousin, Sir Henry Stafford, son of the Duke of Buckingham. The Duke settled a number of manors on the young couple, and as the Lady Margaret held in her own right much property as heiress to both her father and her first husband, she was now a very rich woman indeed. Very little is known of this second marriage, although it lasted for twenty-three years. In his will, dated October 2, 1481, Lord Stafford bequeathed to his son-in-law (?) Henry, "a trapper of four new horse harness;" he appointed his "entirely and best beloved wife, Margaret, Countess of Richmond," sole executrix of his will, and left her the remainder of his property without any restrictions whatever. Such was his confidence in her ability and judgment. He was buried, at his own request, in the church of the College of Plessy, in Essex, founded by his ancestor, Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, sixth son of Edward III.

It appears likely that not only during her early widowhood, but for some years after becoming the wife of Lord Stafford, the Lady Margaret continued to live at Pembroke Castle. Here she was under the immediate protection of her brother-in-law, the Earl of Tudor, who could be relied on to protect the interests of his brother's widow and child. Some such protection was absolutely necessary. The country was in a most unsettled condition during the troublous times of Henry VI. The Beauforts considered themselves as rightful claimants to the throne in case King Henry had no heir. This alone would make their position conspicuous at all times and in periods of unrest positively dangerous; besides, many members of the family held important positions in the kingdom which marked them out for favor or disgrace, according to which side was temporarily in power. Margaret's uncle, the Duke of Somerset, was at one time Prime Minister, but was sent to the Tower by the Protector. The Earl of Tudor was always faithful to the kingly brother to whom he owed so much, so that the fortunes of the Countess of Richmond and her little son were naturally bound up with those of the Lancastrian party and fluctuated with them. Lady Margaret, therefore, with that prudence which all her biographers so much extol, decided to keep her son as far removed as possible from the court and public life. Henry's double relation to the

House of Lancaster made this even more imperative. Wales, with its romantic devotion to the very name of Tudor, was manifestly the safest retreat, and Pembroke Castle was a very strong fortress, so situated as to be able to withstand any ordinary attack, a not entirely impossible contingency in view of the constant fighting going on between the two factions. This seclusion had the further advantage of enabling the Countess to train personally the mind of her young son and develop his character in accordance with her own lofty ideals. All Henry's biographers allude to the admirable tuition bestowed on him by his exemplary and judicious mother.

After the crowning of Edward IV. the youthful Earl was attainted, his possessions taken from him and bestowed on the Duke of Clarence, though the dower rights of the Lady Margaret, as well as the lands inherited from her father, were left to her. Yet she and her son remained more or less objects of suspicion, so that when Sir William Herbert, as a reward for his labors in behalf of the House of York, obtained a grant of the castle, town and lordship of Pembroke, he was ordered to take up his residence there and assume custody of the attainted family. The condition of the young Henry was now practically one of mild imprisonment; probably, however, the presence of young people of his own age, the children of Sir William, was a benefit to him in his secluded life. He seems, too, to have won the affections of his new guardians; contemporary accounts describe him as a lovable boy. It was even proposed that he should in due time marry Maud, one of Sir William's daughters. During the brief interval in 1470 when Henry VI. was temporarily reinstated, Jasper Tudor took his nephew to London and presented him to the King. Young Henry was now fourteen years of age. On being brought before the King—some biographers say at a great banquet in London, others place the meeting at Eton—after he "had beheld him long holding his peace, and marveling at the goodly wit of the child, said in this wise to the nobles that were at that time: 'Lo, this is he, this is he, I say, to whom both we and our adversaries shall give place to in possession.'" The popular belief in the sanctity of King Henry caused much attention to be paid to this prophecy, and while it gave the youthful earl more prominence among his party as a possible heir to the throne, it also made his position more dangerous. The King, too, is said to have advised sending his nephew across the seas for safekeeping. The Lady Margaret saw the wisdom of this advice, and with her characteristic promptness immediately set about carrying it out, though it meant separation for an indefinite time from the object of her dearest affection. Jasper Tudor's own position, even in his native Wales, was a very insecure one, so it was decided that he, as well as the

young Henry, should proceed secretly to Tendy, and there set sail for France, which they accordingly did. But a storm cast them upon the shores of Brittany, and though they were kindly received by Francis, the reigning Duke, the young Earl was detained as a hostage. This mishap was an added blow to the sorrowing mother and put her fortitude to a severe test. But the Duke treated Henry with courtesy, though refusing to allow him to depart, and Margaret must have felt relief in realizing that he was at least safe from the machinations of Edward and Richard, for his detention continued after the latter king's accession, in spite of the efforts made to get control of his person. Fortunately the Countess was able to hold communication with him through her many faithful adherents.

Not long after the death of Sir Henry Stafford, Margaret's mother, the Dowager Duchess of Somerset, also passed away; the Countess, left absolutely alone, married for the third time. There is reason to suppose that Margaret entered into this marriage principally from the desire of benefiting her son by an alliance with one of the greatest nobles of the realm. Thomas, Lord Stanley, Steward of the King's household, Lord of the Isle of Man, a descendant, like Margaret, of John of Gaunt, allied by marriage to the powerful Earl of Warwick, wielded a power scarcely less than that of the throne itself. In addition, his personal character and his great services to the Yorkist cause made him still more prominent. After the marriage Lord Stanley took his wife to Derby House, a magnificent mansion that he had recently built on St. Benet's Hill, London. The sudden death of Edward IV., however, caused an unlooked for change in their lives. Stanley was pledged to support the claims of the young Edward, but his ten-weeks' reign as Edward V. was succeeded by that of the usurper Richard. Richard while Protector had imprisoned Stanley in the Tower on suspicion, but on taking the throne himself he pursued quite a different policy and endeavored to attach this powerful noble to himself by every possible means. Lord Stanley was made Steward of the King's household, and, with his wife, was summoned to take part in the coronation. This ceremony was made as gorgeous as possible, the ugly facts connected with Richard's usurpation being glossed over with an imposing magnificence hitherto unknown. The Queen's train was borne by the Countess of Richmond, while at the banquet that followed in Westminster Hall she took her place with princesses of the blood royal, "not far removed from the Queen's person." We read that there was sent her for this occasion from the royal household "ten yards of scarlet for her livery and a long gown, made of six yards of crimson velvet, purpled, with the same quantity of white cloth of gold, and another long gown made of

six and a half yards of blue velvet, purfled, with equal quantity of crimson cloth of gold." We may be quite sure that the Lady Margaret's gay "purfled" gown—one feels a human curiosity to know what vagary of fashion was so described—covered a heavy heart filled with sorrow for the fate of that dearly loved son, away from his home and country, unjustly deprived of his possessions and freedom.

In accordance with his plan of binding the great Stanley to his cause by favors, Richard soon made him Lord High Constable for life and a member of the Order of the Garter.

And now comes a period in the life of the Countess, when for the first time we hear a note of adverse criticism from one or two of her biographers. She has been accused of duplicity for taking part in the coronation ceremonies and apparently acquiescing in Richard's sovereignty while secretly plotting his downfall. But her king's command to appear at court was not to be disobeyed; indeed, such disobedience might have cost not only her own life, but that of her husband as well. It was obviously impossible for Lord Stanley to absent himself; his devotion to the family of Edward was well known and laid him open to suspicion; Richard's queen, Anne, was his niece by marriage; he had been released from the Tower and had honors heaped upon him by the new king. By every sentiment of loyalty he was bound to support the throne, which he apparently did without disguising his affection for the children of Edward. In the early days of Richard's reign, while her husband was receiving such substantial proofs of the King's favor, the Countess seemed to have pleaded, though in vain, for her son's restoration to his rights. There is nothing to prove, however, that after she had been made a party to Buckingham's designs, she approached the King in any way or appeared publicly in court. She was no doubt aware of the stronger claims of the House of York to the crown, but Henry VI. had been recognized as her legal sovereign, and she had accepted Edward IV., but, as one of her biographers remarks, "in Margaret's eyes Richard was a usurper and a regicide," and all intercession for her son's release having failed, her conscience evidently allowed her to follow the pleadings of her mother's heart. When the Duke of Buckingham, who was Henry Stafford, her nephew by her second marriage, proposed the dethronement of Richard and the placing of Henry on the throne, she entered heartily into the plan and immediately set to work towards its fulfillment. Bishop Morton, of Ely, who had always been a faithful follower of Henry VI. and Edward IV., and who had in fact been imprisoned by Richard in Buckingham's own castle of Brecknock, brought his great experience and wisdom to the aid of the confederates. It was

decided that if a marriage could be arranged between Henry and the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., a union which had even been suggested by Edward himself, the crown should be offered to the young Earl. Elizabeth of York, being the legitimate heir of Edward, would bring added strength to her husband's claim and attract many of the discontented Yorkists to his cause. While Richmond was on his way to be crowned at York, the Countess of Richmond started on a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Worcester. The first conference between Buckingham and the Countess seems to have taken place when they met quite by accident at this time. Some writers maintain, however, that it was only after this meeting that Buckingham remembered the presumptive rights of Margaret and her son and then broached the subject to the Countess. In any event, having once determined on her course of action, the Lady Margaret pursued it with characteristic promptness and energy. She sent her Welsh physician, Dr. Lewis, in whom she had absolute confidence, to consult with the unfortunate Queen Elizabeth, then in sanctuary at Westminster. The Queen Dowager eagerly assented to the proposal, sent her daughter's pledge to the exiled Henry and promised to enlist the aid of the most powerful of the Yorkist nobles in their designs. Margaret sent a trusty agent to her son with large sums of money, and efforts were made by Buckingham and other friends of the movement to obtain aid from Brittany, Flanders and other European courts, but in spite of all these efforts the plot failed. The Duke of Buckingham was put to death and all others who were unable to escape were attainted. The Countess of Richmond was not attainted in the general bill, but at the King's instigation Parliament passed a special bill, by which her vast possessions and dignities were taken from her; the act, after stating that the "said Countess made chevesancez of great sums of money . . . to be employed to the execution of the said treason and malicious purpose . . ." goes on to say that "remembering the good and faithful service that Thomas Lord Stanley hath done and intendeth to do to our said sovereign lord and for the good love and trust that the king hath in him . . . remitteth the great punishment of attainder of the said Countess;" but she "was to be kept in some secret place at home, without any servant or company." Thus the Countess, for her share in the uprising, became practically a prisoner in her own house, with her husband as jailer.

Stanley appears to have remained neutral at this time; one would like to believe that he was ignorant of the plot. However, he actually became a party to the second attempt, when Henry landed at Milford Haven, in his native county of Pembrokeshire, August 8, 1485. It is believed that Henry met his mother and Lord Stanley

by appointment before proceeding into Leicestershire, where the opposing forces met at Bosworth. Shakespeare makes use of the tradition as far as the meeting between Richmond and his stepfather are concerned, though the Countess herself does not appear in the drama. In the meantime Stanley had already fallen under Richard's suspicion, and that astute monarch required that Lord Strange, the great soldier's heir, should be delivered to his keeping as a gauge of his father's fidelity. Just before the battle, when Richard sent a message to Stanley threatening to behead his heir if Stanley proved treacherous, the sturdy father sent this reply, worthy of his character as history presents it to us: "Tell King Richard to act as it so pleaseth him—the Lord of the Isle of Man has other sons alive." Fortunately for the brave father, the King was prevented from carrying out this bloody threat before the battle as he had intended, so the young man's life was saved. At the moment of victory it was Stanley who crowned his stepson as King, placing on his head Richard's own crown, found, as tradition says, in a hawthorn bush on the field of battle. Among the devices on Henry's magnificent tomb in the chapel that he built in Westminster may be seen a crown hidden in a bush; his coronation on the battlefield was represented in one of the window lights.

After fourteen years of painful separation the Countess now had her dearest wish gratified; not only was her son restored to her, but largely through her influence and labors he was acknowledged as the rightful King of England, and through his wise marriage the disastrous Wars of the Roses were brought to an end. From henceforth Margaret's connection with public affairs ceases; she who had been called by a contemporary poet, "mother, author, plotter, counsellor of union," is now heard of no more in councils of state, though her son had great respect for her judgment and is known to have consulted her on more than one occasion. Henry was crowned October 30, 1485, the Countess being present. Though it must have been a day of intense happiness to her, yet Fisher says, "she never yet was in that prosperity, but the greater it was, the more always she dreaded the adversity. For when the King, her son, was crowned in all that great triumph and glory, she wept marvelously." Truly, indeed, did she evince, as one of her biographers says, "the lowly mind possessing yet not possessed by these outward shows." Here indeed lay the secret of her being able to detach herself so completely from the privileges of her rank to devote herself to the service of those who needed her help, either materially or intellectually.

Immediately after Henry's accession to the throne Parliament met and amongst many statutes repealed the special act of attainder

against Margaret and confirmed the settlements made on her marriage with Stanley, which had been taken away through Richard's action against her. Henry seems always to have felt the greatest love and reverence for his mother and to have shown his affection by many substantial acts. It is a pleasing trait in a character rather cold by nature. Besides the general restoration of her rights granted by Parliament, the King by a special grant "empowered her to sue and be sued as a single woman and to make grants, etc., as if she were unmarried." This was a privilege that hitherto had been reserved to the Queen Consort, and of course left the Countess of Richmond free to devote her wealth to works of charity and the encouragement of learning. When Caxton in 1472 set up his printing press in the precincts of Westminster Abbey she became one of his earliest patrons; she not only bought books from him, but engaged him to print others; some of these she herself translated from the French, others she empowered him to translate.

One of Caxton's earliest works, "*The Hystorye of King Blanchardyne and Queen Eglantyne his Wyfe*," was dedicated to her. In the stilted language of that time he says: "Unto the right noble puissant and excellent princess, my redoubted lady, my lady Margaret, Duchess¹ of Somerset, mother unto our natural and sovereign lord and most Christian King Henry the Seventh . . . I, William Caxton, his most indigne humble subject and little servant, present this little book I late received in French from her good grace, and her commandment withal, for to reduce and translate it into our maternal and English tongue; which book I had long to fore sold to my said lady, and knew that the story of it was honest and joyful to all virtuous young noble gentlemen and women." He then goes on to make this quaint plea for the reading of romances: "For under correction, in my judgment, histories of noble feats and valiant acts of arms and war, which have been achieved in old time of many noble princes, lords and knights, are as well for to see and know their valiantness, . . . as it is to occupy the ken and study overmuch in books of contemplation." He concludes the dedication: "Beseeching my said lady's bounteous grace to receive this little book in grace of me her humble servant; and to pardon me of the rude and common English, where as shall be found fault; for I confess me not learned, ne in knowing the art of rhetorick, ne of such gay terms as now be said in these days and used. But I hope that it shall be understanden of the readers and hearers; and that shall suffice. Beseeching Almighty God to grant to her most noble good grace long life and the accomplishment of

¹ Either Caxton made a mistake in Lady Margaret's title or is calling her "Duchess" as a matter of courtesy.

her high noble and joyous desires in this present life; and after this short and transitory life everlasting life in heaven. Amen."

The Lady Margaret "greatly delighted" in the seven penitential psalms, and at her request Bishop Fisher published a treatise on them, which was printed by Pynson, the third of the early printers. Pynson also printed at the Countess' expense a revised copy of the Sarum Breviary. It was at her instance, too, that Henry Watson translated Brant's "Ship of Fools" from French into English and that Wynkyn de Worde printed it. Walter Hylton's "Ladder of Perfection" was a book much loved by the Countess of Richmond; she translated this herself and had it printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1484. An introductory verse says:

This heavenly book, more precious than gold,
Was lately directed with great humillity,
For godly pleasure therein to behold,
Unto the right noble Margaret, as ye see,
The King's mother, of excelent bounty.
Harry the Seventh, that Jesu him preserve.
This mighty Princess hath commanded me
To imprint this book, her grace for to deserve.

The author, addressing himself to the leisure class then arising in England, gives the most practical advice as to the union of the active and the contemplative life. He says: "By the one, thou shalt bring forth the fruit of many good deeds in help of thy Christian brethren; by the other, thou shalt become fair, clear sighted, and clean in the Supreme Brightness, which is God . . . Not neglecting thy children, thy servants, thy tenants and all thy Christian brethren, nor letting them decay nor perish for want of looking to. For thou must think that since God has put thee into that estate of life it is the very best for thee, and that thou canst not do better than in performing all that belongs to it in the very best manner, and with all the willingness and gladness of mind thou art able. This I say to thee, not as though thou didst it not, but that thou shouldest do it better, with more alacrity and cheerfulness by reason of my writing." Lady Margaret is said to have modeled her spiritual life largely on the "Ladder of Perfection." Certainly no one familiar with the works of charity and piety of her later years can doubt that she did indeed lead this twofold life with both "alacrity and cheerfulness." Some few copies of this work are still in existence, as also of "The Mirror of Gold," published in 1507. This has many woodcuts, some full-page ones, with ornamental borders; one cut has the royal arms, with Margaret's name flower, the daisy, arranged in groups of three. A singular representation of the Last Judgment shows our Saviour seated, with His hands raised; one angel with a trumpet calls the dead to arise, another plays on a violin, while in the centre four angels are carrying the blessed

to heaven in a large sheet. This book was very popular in its day.

The Countess of Richmond's literary work is praised for being free from "the prevailing fault of English diction in the fifteenth century, the affectation of Anglicizing Latin words." Her translation from the French of Gerson's "Imitation of Christ" was printed in 1503 by Wynkyn de Worde and was the first English edition of that immortal work; two manuscript copies, of about 1460, may be seen, one in Cambridge and the other in Trinity College, Dublin. An extract from the work will show how well it compares with the best English of to-day: "Lord, I come unto Thee, to the end that health may come unto me of Thy gift, and that I may joy at the holy feast that Thou hast made ready unto me, by Thy sweet benignity, in the which my Saviour is all that I may or ought to desire; for Thou art my health, my redemption, my strength, honor and joy. Alas! my Lord God, make the soul of Thy daily servant joyous, for, my Lord Jesus, I have raised my soul unto Thee, and now desire devoutly and reverently to receive Thee into my house, to the end that I may deserve with Zacheus to be blessed of Thee, and to be accounted among the children of Abraham. My soul desireth Thy body, my heart desireth to be united and onely with Thee; give Thyself unto me, good Lord, and then I suffice, for without Thee no consolation nor comfort is good; without Thee I may not be, and without Thy visitation I may not live."

Lady Margaret's contemporaries welcomed this version of the "Imitation" in the vernacular; the first edition was soon exhausted. Pynson brought out a second edition the same year and continued to print others.

Lady Margaret must have owned quite a library, judging by the standing of that time. Fisher says: "Right studious she was in books, which she had in great number, both in English and French." Her love of literature must have been well known, and no doubt many precious volumes were brought to her notice by friends and booksellers. Her mother-in-law, the Duchess of Buckingham, left her by will "a Book of English being a Legend of Saints, a Book of French called *Lucum*, another book of French of the Epistles and Gospels and a *Primmer* with clasps of silver gilt, covered with purple velvet." The "*Primmer*" was a prayer-book for the use of the laity. As books by reason of their great cost could be owned only by the nobles and the wealthy, many were beautifully gotten up for these patrons in imitation of illuminated manuscripts, and their covers were of costly materials, embellished with fine metal work, sometimes inlaid with gems.

But in her thirst for knowledge Lady Margaret by no means neglected the more usual accomplishments of the women of her day.

Some knowledge of medicine in a simple, practical way was certainly hers; we read of her tending the poor in person, dressing their wounds and curing their diseases. In needlework, too, she was skilled; some specimens of her embroidery were still to be seen in her early home at Bletsoe as late as the reign of James I. Some other handiwork—probably a kind of tapestry—is described as “a carpet with the arms and alliances of the family;” this is still in existence and much treasured by the owners.

In his anxiety to have his own claim to the throne recognized, Henry deferred his marriage until January, 1486. It was celebrated “with all possible religious and glorious magnificence at court and by the people with bonfires, dancings, songs and banquets.” At the marriage procession “each partisan of the Lancastrian House gave his hand to a lady of the Yorkist party, she holding a bouquet (though the season was midwinter!) of the red and white roses combined.” We do not read of the presence of the Countess of Richmond at the marriage, but doubtless she was there even if only as a looker-on from some sheltered place, leaving the public honors to the young Queen.

Margaret seems to have felt for her son's wife the affection of a mother. Some authorities say that she had been for a short period during the reign of Richard III. a sort of “lady governess” to the young Elizabeth; no doubt she then learned to love the “Lady Bessie,” so renowned for her sweet and gentle disposition. The Countess was much at court during the early years of her son's reign; her influence seems to have been felt in encouraging a true spirit of religion as well as a taste for literature, which the gradual cessation of wars left the nobility more at leisure to cultivate. She appears to have displayed a marvelous tact in guiding the young Queen at the beginning of her career and yet keeping herself studiously in the background as far as political matters were concerned. Had she been ambitious, she might easily, through her son's grateful devotion and her own great strength of character, have made herself a power in the land. But such thoughts apparently never entered her mind. One likes to think of her at this period, between her early years of unrest and sorrow and her later ones of saintly devotion solely to God's service, as enjoying in a sweet and natural way the home life of the court, varied by the great functions that characterized the leading events of the reign. We read of her on the occasion of Henry's public entry into London as viewing the pageant in company with the Queen and the ladies of the court from a secluded place in Bishopsgate. The Queen's coronation, as we know, did not take place until some time after that of Henry, he being very sensitive about owing the throne in

any way to his wife. When the ceremony did take place, however, it was carried out with great pomp and magnificence. A day or two before, a water fête, a popular amusement of that time, took place on the Thames; a great number of boats, some filled with revelers, others with members of the court, passed on the river from Greenwich to the Tower. One striking feature of the pageant was an immense dragon breathing flames, in allusion to the King's Welsh ancestry, a fact to which he referred constantly during his reign. On the actual day of the coronation, the feast of St. Katherine, 1487, all the public honors were reserved for the Queen alone. The King, with his mother and the ladies in attendance upon her, watched the stately ceremony from a platform built high up between the pulpit and the high altar at Westminster, and screened from sight by lattice work and hangings of arms. At the state banquet in Westminster Hall in honor of the coronation the Countess looked on from a similar screened balcony. She heard Mass with the King in St. Stephen's chapel on the following morning, and later in the day, when Elizabeth "kept her estate" in the Parliament chamber, "my ladie the King's mother sat on her right hand." At Christmas time of the same year Lady Margaret came again to the court at Greenwich, where she made the customary gifts of money to the various officials; one account alludes to her giving twenty-six shillings and sixpence, a sum equal to about sixty-five dollars at the present time. Then the heralds announced the gift, "*De hault puissant et excellent princesse la mer du roy notre souveraine countesse de Richmonde et de Derbye, largesse!*"

During 1488 we read of Lady Margaret being at Windsor quite frequently; she seems to have celebrated the principal feasts with her son and the Queen. She is mentioned as assisting at the celebration of the feast of St. George, when she and Elizabeth wore similar robes of the Garter fashioned like those worn by the King and the knights. Much honor was paid her; "at the Te Deum she was censed next after the King and Queen and before the knights companions. On the Sunday following she and the Queen, arrayed in gowns of the livery of the order, rode to evensong in a splendid chair covered with rich cloth of gold and drawn by six horses trapped in the same manner and followed by a suite of twenty-one ladies clad in crimson velvet and riding upon white palfreys sumptuously ornamented."

At Christmas time, 1489, Lady Margaret was again with the royal family at Shene. At the Twelfth Night festivities she is described as wearing "a like mantell and surcoat as the queen with a rich coronnal on her head."

The King was most punctilious about etiquette, and on the birth of Prince Arthur deputed his mother to draw up regulations for

the ceremonious care of the young heir. Numerous governesses, nurses and other attendants were appointed, among them "three chambermaids called rockers." There were provided two cradles of "tree, fair set forth by painter's craft," the larger one being a state cradle, "decked with cloth of gold furred with ermine." The ceremonies to be observed at the christening of the royal infant were also very carefully planned. Two hundred tapers were to be borne before him and the baby prince was to have "a little taper to carry in its hand to the high altar." The Countess is not mentioned as being present at the baptism, though the Earl of Derby was one of the godfathers. Among other matters of etiquette delegated to the King's mother was that of reforming the mourning costume of the ladies of the court. Mourners had been in the habit of wearing a curious sort of chin cloth of linen. By the new ordinance of the Lady Margaret the exact position of this "barbe" was definitely fixed, to vary according to the rank of the lady wearing it. The size of the mantle and the length of the train were also regulated. It was permissible, for instance, for a countess to wear "a train before and another behind; the train before to be narrow, not exceeding the breadth of eight inches, and must be trussed up before under the girdle or borne upon the left arm." This quaint document can still be seen at the Herald's College.

The Christmas season of 1489 seems to have been celebrated with a special display of the old-time English merrymaking. The court was then at Westminster, where they were enlivened by "an abbot of misrule that made much sport and did right well in his office." On Candlemas Day, High Mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Exeter, Richard Fox, who had at one time been chaplain and confessor to the Countess, and at which we are told Sir William Knevet carried her taper. At Whitehall, in the evening, the King and the Queen, with Lady Margaret and the court, "there had a play and after a voyde." The voyde was apparently light refreshments of "comfits"—sweetmeats with ginger and other spices—taken with ipocras or other sweet wines. The Countess also came to witness the ceremonies incident to the creation of Prince Henry as Duke of York, when, we are told, she wore her coronet and came immediately after the Queen. The Earl of Derby took part in this and many other of the great court functions. We read of the presence of the Countess at court again in November of the following year, when a daughter was born to the royal couple. The little princess was named Margaret in compliment to her grandmother, who was godmother as well and made a christening gift of a chest of silver gilt full of gold. The goldsmith's art was at its height in Tudor England, and the intrinsic value of such a chest, with its intricate

carving and decorations, would be great quite irrespective of its contents.

About the last great festivity at which we hear of the Countess was the marriage of the young Prince Arthur with Catherine of Arragon. This seems to have eclipsed in magnificence every other event celebrated in the reign of Henry VII. The Countess appears on this occasion to have stayed at the mansion given her by the King, called Cold Harbor, where she entertained many of the English and Spanish nobles. One of the chroniclers tells us "the place was right royal and pleasantly beseen . . . enhanced with rich cloths of Arras and in the hall a goodly cupboard made and erect with great plenty of plate both silver and gilt and they were set at the board encompained and coupled every of them, as well the men as the women, with his companion of England to make them cheer and solace." It is to be hoped these "companions" were able to converse with each other through the medium of a common language, otherwise one fears that they could have given each other but little "cheer and solace" after all. But we are assured that "there were dainties and delicacies with divers wines abundant and plenteously," so no doubt the feast was merry enough. During the festivities, which lasted for nearly a week, there were many jousts and banquets, at some of which the Countess was undoubtedly present. She is specially mentioned as being at a banquet in the Parliament chamber, and again on the same evening in Westminster Hall at "an interlude and a disguising with dances," or as we should say, a masquerade. In November the court went by water to Richmond in great state; the Earl of Derby had his barge and the Countess another, "right goodly covered, painted and beseen." The street pageants, from London Bridge to St. Paul's Churchyard, were wonderful, indeed. Some may be disposed to blame a lady of the Countess of Richmond's recognized piety for taking part in such gorgeous displays; but we must remember that one so closely allied to royalty could not very well dispense with its outward show, more particularly at that period, when the "boast of heraldry and pomp of power" were so lavishly displayed. As time went on, however, she stayed at the court less frequently; in her more retired life at her various manors she gradually came to devote more and more of her time to prayer and good works for her dependents and humble neighbors. At Torrington, in Devonshire where she sometimes stayed, "pitying the long path the pastor had from home to church, she gave to him and his successors the manor-house there, with lands thereunto." At Sandford Peverell, another house of hers in the same county, an aisle in the church was said to have been built by her; her arms and those of the Earl of Derby are still to be seen

there. At Durham the church was probably benefited by her bounty, for her statue and coronets ornament the battlements; this would scarcely be the case had she not been a benefactor.

About the year 1497 Lady Margaret, with her husband's permission, renewed a vow of chastity that she had made in her widowhood; about the same time she began that life of asceticism which lasted until her death; in accordance with a custom of the age, she wore a girdle of hair and practiced other austerities. Bishop Fisher, whose friendship and influence were to count for much good in her life, had become acquainted with her shortly before. He mentions in his accounts as proctor of Cambridge a visit to Greenwich in 1495, when he was presented to the King's mother. She was quick to perceive his great attainments and spirituality, and before long chose him as her chaplain and confessor. He gives us in his funeral sermon many details of her life of prayer and mortification; he says that she rose at five, and after private devotions said the Matins of Our Lady with one of her gentlewomen. It was quite a usual thing for English ladies of that day to recite these Matins. The Lady Margaret, however, did more; she was accustomed to say also the Matins of the day with her chaplain, after which she usually heard four or five Masses, continuing in prayer till dinner time, "which of the eating day was ten of the clock and upon the fasting day eleven." After dinner followed stations to three altars daily, with evensong both of the day and of Our Lady, with other prayers, and just before she went to bed she spent "a large quarter of an hour" in her chapel. The same clear mind which had guided her in the great crises of her life must have enabled her to arrange the details of her daily duties with the least possible loss of time, for in spite of all these hours devoted to prayer, we find her being praised for the orderly management of her household. This was not a small task by any means when we realize that a lady of the rank of the Countess of Derby might number several hundred attendants of various degrees on her estate. The duties of hospitality and care of the poor were scrupulously observed and some time would still be left for reading.

The King showed his confidence in his mother's great abilities in many ways; among others he placed in her care (1485) the young sons of the Duke of Buckingham, to be brought up as became their rank. The Lady Margaret had charge of their property, which she must have managed most successfully, as the young Duke, when he attained his majority, was one of the richest nobles at a wealthy court. The Countess had the care at times of her grandsons and of her young stepbrothers, and she educated several other young men at her own expense. It is probable that some of these lived

in her house, as was the custom when great nobles became the patrons of promising youths. A letter is extant, written from Windsor, in which Lady Margaret asks the Chancellor of the University to send a Maurice Westbury to instruct "certain young gentlemen at her finding."

The King visited his mother at her manor of Colyweston, and later we heard of him as making a "progress" into Lancashire, there "to recreate his spirits and solace himself with his mother the Lady Margaret, wife to the Earl of Derby." The Queen accompanied him on this visit, and we hear of a sum of money being given "to the women that sang before the King and Queen." At other times we hear of her minstrels being paid for their services on great occasions. At one period of her life the Lady Margaret had a poet in her employ as well, all this being quite in accordance with the customs of the age. It is thought that Erasmus held this post for a while, though the records do not mention his name. The Countess was essentially a great lady and lived as such, but the ordering of her household and carrying out of the etiquette of her rank absorbed neither her thoughts nor her time. She entered heart and soul into the project which the Pope (in 1500) had in view of an alliance among Christian princes for a war against the Turks, and she is quoted as saying that "on condition that the princes of Christendom would combine themselves against the common enemy the Turks, she would willingly follow the host and help wash their clothes for the love of Jesu."

The Lady Margaret's translations and letters rank as part of the scanty literature of the fifteenth century. One of her less ceremonious letters brings to us from the more formal past a touch of pleasantry that appeals very humanly to our lighter spirits of to-day. It is written to Thomas Butler, Earl of Ormond, Chamberlain to the Queen, probably during his embassy to France, 1495 or 1496:

"My Lord Chamberlain, I thank you heartily that you list so soon remember me with my gloves, the which were right good, save they were too much for my hand. I think the ladies in that part be great ladies all, and according to their great estate they have great personages. As for news here I am sure you shall have more (seurte) than I can send you; blessed be God, the King, the Queen and all our sweet children be in good health. The Queen hath been a little crased,² but now she is well, God be thanked; her sickness is so good as I would, but I trust hastily it shall, with God's grace, whom I pray give you good speed in your great matters, and bring you well and soon home.

² In poor health.

"Written at Shene the XXV. day of April.

"M. RICHMOND.

"To my Lord the Queen's Chamberlain."

Lodge calls the following "the most polished specimen extant of the epistolary style of her time." She writes from Calais in 1501 to the King about recovering money that had been loaned to the Duke of Orleans while a prisoner in England:

"My dearest and only desired Joy in this world:

"With my most hearty Blessings and most humble commendations—I pray our Lord to reward and thank your Grace for that it hath pleased your Highness so kindly and lovingly to be content to write your letter of thanks to the French King, for my great matter, that so long hath in suit, as Master Welby hath shewed me your bounteous goodness is pleased. I wish my dear Heart, and my fortune be to recover it, I trust ye shall well perceive I shall deal towards you as a kind, loving Mother; and if I should never have it, yet your kind dealing is to me a thousand times more than all that Good I can recover and all the French King's might be mine withal. My dear Heart, and it may please your Highness to license Master Whitstongs for this time to present your honorable letters, and begin the process of my cause; for that he so well knoweth the matter, and also brought me the writings from the said French King, with his other letters to his Parliament at Paris; it should be greatly to my help, as I think, but all will I remit to your pleasure; and if I be too bold in this, or any of my Desires, I humbly beseech your Grace of pardon, and that your Highness take no displeasure.

"My good King, I have now sent a servant of mine into Kendall to receive such annuities as be yet hanging upon the account of Sir William Wall, my Lord's Chaplain, whom I have clearly discharged; and if it will please your Majesty's own heart, at your leisure to send me a Letter, and command me that I suffer none of my Tenants be retained with no man, but that they be kept for my Lord of York, your faire, sweet son, for whom they be most mete; it shall be a good excuse for me to my Lord and Husband; and then I may well and without displeasure cause them all to be sworn, the which shall not after be long undone. And, my sweet King, Felding this bearer hath prayed me to beseech you to be his good Lord in a matter he sueth for to the Bishop of Ely, now, as we hear, elect for a little office nigh to London. Verily, my King, he is a good and a wise well ruled Gentleman, and full truly hath served you well accompanied, as well at your first, as all other occasions; and that causeth us to be the more bold and gladder also to speak for him; howbeit my Lord Marquis hath been very low

to him in Times past, by cause he would not be retained with him; and truly, my good King, he helpeth me right well in such matters as I have business within thees parts. And, my dear Heart, I now beseech you of pardon of my long and tedious Writing, and pray Almighty God give you as long, good and prosperous life as ever had Prince, and as hearty blessings as I can ask of God.

"At Calais Town, this day of St. Anne's, that I did bring into this World my good and gracious Prince, King and only beloved Son. By

"Your humble Servant, Bede-woman and Mother,

"MARGARET R.³

"To the King's Grace."

A later letter on the same subject has come down to us, though in bad condition as the result of a fire:

"My own sweet and most dear King and all my worldly joy, in as humble manner as I can think I recommend me to your Grace, and most heartily beseech our Lord to bless you; and my good Heart, where that you say that the French King hath at this time given me courteous answer and written . . . letter of favor to his court of Parliament for the true expedition of my matter which so long hath hanged, . . . And, if it so might like your Grace, to do the same to the Cardinal, which as I understand is your faithful, true and loving servant I wiss my very joy, as I oft have shewed, and I fortune to get this or any part thereof, there shall neither be that or any good I have but it shall be yours, and at your commandment as surely and with as good a will as any you have in your coffers, as would God you could know it as verily as I think it. But, my dear Heart, I will no more encumber your Grace with further writing in this matter, for I am sure your chaplain and servant Doctor Whitstone hath shewed your Highness the circumstance of the same. And if it so may please your Grace, I humbly beseech the same to give further credence also to this bearer. And our Lord give you as long good life, health and joy, as your most noble heart can desire, with as hearty blessings as our Lord hath given me power to give you.

"At Colyweston the 24th day of January, by your faithful true bede-woman, and humble mother,

MARGARET R."

The Countess of Richmond was a very wealthy woman, being an extensive landowner in England and to a certain extent in Wales. At Holywell, in Flintshire, there is a small but lovely Gothic chapel built over St. Winifred's Well, said to have been the gift of the Countess; a carved stone can still be seen showing

³ "R" standing for Richmond, not for a royal signature.

the profiles of the Earl and herself. As a landowner, Margaret performed many duties in connection with the administration of justice which seem somewhat strange to us to-day. At a dispute about boundaries which had existed for a long time between some of the inhabitants of Lincolnshire, a commission was appointed through her efforts as Lady of the Manor, and the final papers settling the matter are signed with her seal as well as those of the commissioners. It has been claimed that she was even a justice of the peace, a position certainly held by more than one woman in mediæval England. An instance is given of one who dispensed justice girt with the sword of state!

Truly, the Countess of Richmond and Derby was no weakling! That she could be severe when necessary, we can see by the following letter to the Mayor of Coventry:

"By the King's Mother. .

"Trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. And where we of late, upon the complaint of one Owen, Burgess of the city there, addressed our other letters unto you, and willed you by the same and in our name, to call upon you the parties comprised in the same complaint. And therefore to order the variance depending betwixt them according to good conscience. Albeit as it is said, the said Owen can or may have no reasonable answer of you in that behalf to our marvel. Wherefore we will and in the King's name command you esoones to call before you the said parties and roundly to examine them. And thereupon to order and determine the premisses as may stand with good reason, and the equity of the King's laws. So as no complaint be made unto us hereafter in that behalf. Endeavoring you thus to do, as you tender the King's pleasure and ours, and the due ministration of Justice. Given under our signet at our manor of Colyweston the last day of September.

"To our trusty and well-beloved, the Mayor of the city of Coventry, and his brethren of the same, and to any of them."

Later in Lady Margaret's life, after she had begun her benefactions to the two great universities, her learning, judgment and inflexible spirit of justice were so well known that when a serious dispute arose between the town and the University of Cambridge, an appeal was made to her to help adjust the matter. Arbitrators were named at her suggestion, and both parties gave "bonds to abide by such award as might be made." The Lady Margaret was present at the examination, and her seal was affixed to the decision, which seems to have been most comprehensive: it contained thirty articles and provided for not only the immediate settlement, but for any disagreement that might arise in the future.

A letter from the University to the Countess of Richmond some time after her settlement of this dispute shows their appreciation of her efforts in their behalf:

"Pleaseth it your noble Grace, most excellent Princess, our special good lady and singular beenfactress. That forasmuch as not only heretofore ye have many and great benefits exhibited unto us, mercifully always condescending to our necessities, but also cease not daily by heaping benefits upon benefits, and adding bounteousness unto bounteousness to confer more and more upon us, your poor scholars, as witnesseth neither small nor few your gracious memorials here among us. Where also ye so generously tender the restfulness of us all that for the more quietous setting of ourselves to virtue and learning ye will us to appoint and certify your Grace of such articles in the composition between ourselves and the town as we think ourselves aggrieved with. According to the which your Gracious commandment we shall with all diligence apply ourselves, beseeching your Highness to see good direction and due reformation be made. We could not at this time contain, but to use our tongues and pens, to signify the vehemence of our joy . . . not causeless in us conceived of your generousness, and that when we have done what we can for your noble Grace by means of our powers or otherwise, yet shall we unfeignedly do much less than we are bound to do, as knoweth the blessed saints, whom we most humble beseech graciously to preserve you and everlastingly with the crown of most glory and joy to reward your goodness unto us ministered. Amen!"

The Countess of Richmond had long been a benefactress of many religious houses, as well as an associate in some. While quite young she was admitted with her mother into the fraternity of the abbey of Croyland, while at various times later on she became affiliated to three or four others. In accordance with that Christian spirit of democracy that prevailed in mediæval England, she became a member, in Stanford, of the Guild of St. Katherine, to which she was admitted on the same day as a servant of hers, one Richard Cotimont. To a high mental and spiritual outlook she united a very practical mind. She made an attempt at draining the Great Fen, in Cambridgeshire; the attempt, while unsuccessful, showed her sense of the importance of such a work in the interests of public health and the proper development of the land. While living at her manor of Colyweston, in Northamptonshire, she made opportunities for the poor of the neighborhood to earn a living by working at the slate quarries on her estate. One of her charities is in existence to-day. When contributing to the endowment of the magnificent Lady Chapel that her son added to Westminster

Abbey, she also set aside funds to provide for "alms and bread" to be given in the college hall every week to poor widows. She erected a chantry at Wimborne, where the souls of her parents were to be perpetually prayed for; and about the time that Henry began the construction of his chapel his mother had in view the increasing of the number of chantry monks and of preparing her own place of burial there. In the meantime her desire for the encouragement of sound learning led her to found readerships in divinity in both Oxford and Cambridge. These foundations bear the date of the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady, to which she had special devotion.

Lady Margaret seems always to have had a perfectly clear idea of what she wanted to accomplish. Her writings show that she had the amount of legal knowledge common to the great land-owners of the time, either men or women; we need not be surprised then at the minuteness with which the duties of the reader are set forth. Among them was the obligation of remembering the foundress whenever he said Mass. Some of the other regulations throw light on the university life of the time. The professor of divinity, as we should call him, was "to read in the divinity schools to every one, without fee or reward other than his salary, such works in divinity as the chancellor or vice chancellor with the college of doctors shall judge necessary for an hour . . . 7 to 8 A. M., or at such other time as the chancellor shall think fit." During Lent, with the sanction of the chancellor, the reading might be dispensed with, so that the reader himself or the clerics to whom he had been preaching might be free to preach to others outside of the university. Blessed John Fisher, venerated even then for his learning and holy life, was made the first reader at Cambridge; John Roper held a similar position at Oxford. Among the early successors of the Bishop at Cambridge was Erasmus, who had long been a friend of his and who had been residing for some years at the university, his room at Queen's College being still pointed out to visitors. Fisher, being a little later made doctor of divinity and vice chancellor of the university, was obliged to give up the readership. Realizing the great need at this time of regular preaching to the laity, he probably suggested to the Countess another means of furthering the good work they both had at heart, and so a preachership "to the praise and honor of the Holy Name of Jesus and the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary" was founded. This "preacher was to be a perpetual fellow of some college in Cambridge," and it was incumbent upon him to preach at least once in two years at St. Paul's Cross or at St. Margaret's, Westminster, and also at various places specified outside of London.

By this means many places remote from the capital had the opportunity of hearing occasional sermons from men well qualified for the task, and at the same time encouragement was given to the practice of preaching, which had fallen somewhat into decay. These preachers, with the younger clergy being trained at both universities, brought in vogue a simpler style of preaching which was more suited to rural parishes and was no doubt of incalculable benefit. Under the direction of Dr. Fisher, Lady Margaret had come to believe that it would be a better work to increase the opportunities for learning at the university than to found the chantry she had proposed at Westminster. She accordingly applied to the King, begging him to change the license he had already granted for that purpose into one for the foundation of a college at Cambridge. Cambridge rather than Oxford would naturally attract the bounty of the Countess, as it had long been connected with her family, many prominent members, notably Cardinal Beaufort, her great-uncle, having studied there, and her saintly confessor's interest in its advancement would, of course, be an important factor in her choice. The King replied to his mother in the following letter:

"Madam, my most entirely well-beloved lady and mother, I recommend me unto you in the most humble and lowly wise that I can, beseeching you of your daily and continual blessings. By your confessor, the bearer, I have received your good and most loving writing, and by the same have heard at good leisure such evidence as he would show unto me on your behalf and thereupon have sped him in every behalf without delay, according to your noble petition and desire, which resteth in two principal points: the one for a general pardon for all manners and causes; the other is for to alter and change part of a license, which I had given unto you before, for to be put into mortmain at Westminster, and of Cambridge, for your soul's health, etc. All which things, according to your desire and pleasure, I have with all my heart and goodwill given and granted unto you. And, Madam, not only in this, but in all other things that I may know should be to your honor and pleasure and weal of your soul, I shall be as glad to please you as your heart can desire it. And I know well that I am as much bounden so to do as any creature living, for the great and singular motherly love and affection that it hath pleased you at all times to bear towards me. Wherefore, mine own most loving mother, in my most hearty manner I thank you, beseeching you of your good continuance in the same. And Madam, your said confessor hath, moreover, shown unto me on your behalf that you of your goodness and kind disposition have given and granted unto me such

title and interest as ye have or ought to have in such debts and duties which are owing and due unto you in France by the French King and others, wherefore, Madam, in my most hearty and humble wise I thank you. Howbeit, I verily (think) it will be right hard to recover it without it be driven by compulsion and force, rather than by any true justice, which is not yet as we think any convenient time to be put in execution. Nevertheless, it hath pleased you to give us a good interest and means if they will not conform them to reason and good justice to diffend or offend at a convenient time when the case shall so require hereafter. For such a chance may fall that this your grant might stand in great stead for a recovery of our right, and to make us free, whereas we be now bound, etc., etc. And verily, Madam, an I might recover it at this time or any other, Ye may be sure ye should have your pleasure therein, as I and all that God has given me is and shall ever (be) at your will and commandment, as I have instructed Master Fisher more largely herein, as I doubt not but he will declare unto you. And I beseech you to send me your mind and pleasure in the same, which I shall be full glad to follow with God's grace, which send and give unto you the full accomplishment of all your noble and virtuous desires.

"Written at Greenwich, the 17th day of July (1504), with the hand of your most humble and loving son, H. R.

"After the writing of this letter your confessor delivered unto me such letters and writings obligatory of your duties in France which it hath pleased you to send unto me, which I have received by an indenture of every parcel of the same. Wherefore eftsoons in my most humble wise I thank you, and I purpose hereafter, at better leisure, to know your mind and pleasure further therein. Madam, I have encumbered you now with this my long writing, but me thinks that I can do no less, considering that it is so seldom that I do write, wherefore I beseech you to pardon me, for verily, Madam, my sight is nothing so perfect as it has been; and I know well it will appear (impair) daily; wherefore I trust that you will not be displeased though I write not so often with mine own hand, for on my faith I have been three days or I could make an end of this Letter.

"To my Lady."

One other letter of the King's to his mother is valuable as showing the delicacy of sentiment that prompted him to offer a bishopric to her confessor—whom all the world knew to be worthy of the high honor—without waiting for her to plead his cause:

"Madam, An I thought I should not offend you, which I will never do willingly, I am well minded to promote Master Fisher,

you confessor, to a bishoprick; and I assure you, Madam, for none other cause, but for the great and singular virtue that I know and see in him, as well in cunning⁴ and natural wisdom, and especially for his good and virtuous living and conversation. And, by the promotion of such a man, I know well it should courage many others to live virtuously, and to take such ways as he doth, which should be a good example to many others hereafter. Howbeit without your pleasure known I will not move him, nor tempt him therein. And therefore, I beseech you that I may know your mind and pleasure in that behalf, which shall be followed as much as God will give me grace. I have in my days promoted many a man unadvisedly, and I would now make some recompension to promote some Good and virtuous men, which I doubt not should best please God, who ever preserve you in good health and long life."

King Henry always took great pains to let it be known that he promoted Dr. Fiher to a bishopric without any suggestion from his mother. Speaking of the matter afterwards, he said:

"Indeed, the modesty of the man, together with my mother's silence, spoke in his behalf." Bishop Fisher corroborates this in a letter written to Bishop Fox, of Winchester, many years after the Countess' death. In alluding to King Henry's bestowal on him of the See of Rochester, calling himself an "unworthy occupant," he goes on to say:

"There are many who believe that his mother, the Countess of Richmond and Derby, that noble and incomparable lady, dear to me by so many titles, obtained the bishopric for me by her prayers to her son. But the facts are entirely different, as your Lordship knows well, who was the King's most intimate counsellor, as you were also of the most illustrious King Henry VIII., who now by right of succession fills his father's throne, as long as your health allowed you to frequent the court. I do not say this to diminish my debt of gratitude to this most excellent lady. My debts are indeed great. Were there no other beside the great and sincere love she bore me above others, as I know for a certainty, yet what favor could equal such love on the part of such a Princess? But besides her love, she was most munificent towards me. For though she conferred on me no ecclesiastical benefice, she had the desire, if it could be done to enrich me, which she proved not by words only, but by deeds; among other instances, when she was about to leave the world. However, as I have spoken her praises in a funeral oration, I will not pursue the subject here, though she never could be praised too much. This only will I add, that though she

⁴ That is, talent.

chose me as her director, to hear her confessions and guide her life, yet I gladly confess that I learnt more from her great virtue than I ever taught her."

The Countess was considerably older than the Bishop, who always revered her as a mother and always wished her to be prayed for at Masses that were said for him.

In 1504 the Earl of Derby died. He seems never to have lost King Henry's favor, even after the treason of his brother, Sir William Stanley. In his will he desired that "his lady should peaceably enjoy all the lordships, manors, etc., assigned for her jointure." He was buried in the priory church of Bourscough, and effigies of himself and his two wives adorn his tomb.

It was the following year that the Countess began the great work by which she is best known—the building of her colleges in Cambridge. A small institution known as "God's House" had been started by Henry VI., but his designs had never been fully carried out. It was suggested by Bishop Fisher that Lady Margaret should build her college on this site. This she accordingly did, having a special pleasure in feeling that she was in any way carrying out the plans of the saintly king, for whom she had great reverence and to whom she considered herself much indebted for many benefits received during the lifetime of her first husband. While, of course, many changes have been made in the buildings in the course of four hundred years, the Master's lodge, with its beautiful oriel, and the gateway, with the statue and armorial bearings of the Countess, still remain as she designed them. The beautiful dining hall shows in excellent condition the lovely oak screen with Lady Margaret's initials supported by the antelopes of the Beauforts. This is varied by a centre design commemorative of Henry VI., showing a crowned "H," and a quaint representation of God's House, having the symbolic Eye of God above it. A portrait over the high table represents the foundress standing, holding a book in her hand, while one of the lights in the stained glass window represents her with the statues of the college. The light at the left shows Blessed John Fisher in his Cardinal's robes, which, however, he never wore in life, Henry VIII. having carried out his grim jest in frightful earnest. But though the Bishop was never allowed to receive his Cardinal's hat, the martyr's crown which the King's vengeance dealt out to him has proved, even in an earthly sense, a far greater honor.

As a recent writer on Cambridge says of the co-founders, "both joined to the spirit of piety an abounding appreciation of the spirit of knowledge." Lady Margaret worked intelligently and sympathetically with the Bishop in the task of compiling the statutes

for the new college. From the very beginning of her foundation she gave it the fullest measure of personal interest, introducing new features and impressing her personality upon it to an unusual degree. It is noteworthy that at Christ's College for the first time in any university literature, as well as theology, was to be studied. This was probably due to the influence of Erasmus, who was in residence at Cambridge at this time, laboring for the introduction of the "New Learning." Bishop Fisher was a friend and patron of Erasmus, and doubtless introduced him to the Countess. In Lady Margaret's statutes it was directed that at least half of the fellows should be natives of the Northern counties. Fisher was a native of York and the Countess had an undying affection for everything connected with the husband of her youth; she was especially interested in Richmond, Yorkshire, "from which place we take our title," which title, by the way, she always used even after that of Derby became her own. She seems to have thought of everything that could add to the efficiency of her college; one of her biographers remarks on the fact of her regulations being "singularly well adapted for guarding against perfunctory discharge of duties." The salaries allowed to the readers were very liberal for those days. In fact, until Lady Margaret founded her chair of divinity in 1502 the lecturers were not paid for that work at all. Lady Margaret had a great desire to help those who showed aptitude for learning, but had not the means to come up to the university to study; in her statutes she decreed that poor scholars should *always* be given the preference. She was the only non-resident founder to have rooms set apart for her use at her college. When not occupied by the Countess herself, they were to be at the disposal of Bishop Fisher. She did make use of them more than once, coming to Cambridge to oversee the progress of building, and again in 1506, when the work was done and the King came up with his mother to see the new buildings. A story is told about her when she was staying at the college after it had been opened; she saw a student about to be punished for some breach of discipline. Looking down from her window, she called, "*Lente, lente* (gently, gently), accounting it better to mitigate his punishment than procure his pardon." The story fully accords with one's idea of her character, combining as it did a strong sense of justice with womanly sympathy.

The noble foundress supplied her college liberally with everything needed for its successful maintenance; the beautiful gold plate for use in the dining hall is still exhibited with pride on days of ceremony. To the library she left a collection of books, principally in Latin and on theology. An instance of her womanly

thoughtfulness is shown in her arranging for a house not far from the town to be fitted up as a residence for the students of Christ's when there might be any epidemic at the university. One regulation of the new college gives us some idea of social life in the university in the early sixteenth century. It was especially forbidden to the fellows to keep "dogs or rapacious birds in the college or to play at dice or cards, except in the hall at Christmas for recreation."

Lady Margaret, who has been called by one of her modern biographers "the greatest benefactress Cambridge has ever known," did not feel that she had done enough in giving one college to Cambridge. After consultation with her friend, Bishop Fisher, she decided on getting the King's license to close St. John's Hospital, a sort of almshouse, which had then very few inmates, and converting it into a college for seculars. Unfortunately, she did not live to see her plans carried out; that work devolved on the saintly Fisher, who worked hard against great difficulties to fulfill his task of executor. The greatest difficulty he had to contend against was the unwillingness of the young King, Henry VIII., to give up some of his prospective inheritance to the new college. As a matter of fact, only a portion of his grandmother's bequest could be secured for this purpose, though Bishop Fisher made up as much as he could out of his personal means, which were small, for his diocese was a poor one and he was a generous benefactor to the needy. Some years elapsed, then, after Lady Margaret's death before the college was finally opened. In the meantime the remaining brethren of St. John's were taken care of and their pensions regularly paid.

Lady Margaret's faithful friend and executor made generous provision for her to be remembered in the Masses and prayers to be offered in the new chapel of St. John's, as well as for memorials of a more material kind. While the Plantagenet rose, the Tudor portcullis and the Beaufort antelopes adorn both of Lady Margaret's colleges, St. John's bears in addition her crest, a demi-eagle rising out of a crown. The stately gate-tower has as its central figure the patron of the institution, St. John the Evangelist. A statue at the entrance to the modern chapel represents the foundress holding a model of her building in her hand, while she stands upon a symbolical figure of Ignorance; she is faced by a statue of her co-worker, the Bishop, trampling upon Vice. Several portraits of both the Lady Margaret and of Bishop Fisher adorn the college, and the arms of both are repeated on the ceiling of the chapel and in the great oriel window. Her portrait hangs over the high table to-day; most of her portraits appear to have

been painted after her death, which may account for the rather stiff, austere look that characterizes them. They represent her "garbed like a nun," as widows frequently dressed, either standing with a book in her hands or kneeling at her priedieu. Some show across the background her motto, "*Souvent me souvient*" (Often I bethink me). This motto appears also over the gateway leading to the gardens at Christ's College.

In the meantime, in April, 1509, King Henry died in his palace at Richmond, and was buried in his magnificent chapel at Westminster. The funeral sermon, which was afterwards published by Wynkyn de Worde at the request of Lady Margaret, was preached by Bishop Fisher at St. Paul's, where the body rested before being taken to Westminster. In his will the King named his "dearest and most entirely beloved mother, Margaret, Countesse of Richmond," as one of his executors. One of her first cares was to try to guide in some way her grandson of eighteen, whose education she had at one time superintended. The youthful Henry followed her advice in the matter of choosing his first privy council, but it is impossible to tell how great her influence might have been in his later life, for Lady Margaret did not long survive her son, dying in June of the same year at Westminster. Bishop Fisher speaks of her patience in her last illness and of her devout reception of the last sacraments, "and so soon after that she was anneled, she departed and yielded up her spirit into the hands of our Lord." She was buried in the aisle of her son's chapel, by the side of him who had always been as she loved to call him "her dearest earthly joy," and in whose interests she had spent the fullest energies of a vigorous mind and a commanding personality.

Erasmus, who had always been a great admirer of the Countess and an ardent sympathizer with her in her support of literature, was chosen to write her epitaph. It is a brief summary of what she accomplished for religion and education:

"To Margaret of Richmond, the mother of Henry VII. and grandmother of Henry VIII., who founded salaries for three Monks in this Convent, for a grammar school at Wymborn, and a preacher of God's Word throughout England; as also for two divinity lecturers, one at Oxford, the other at Cambridge; in which last place she likewise built two Colleges, in honor of Christ and His Disciple St. John. She died in the year of our Lord 1509, June 29." The poet Skelton, who had been Vicar of Trumpington, near Cambridge, and was conversant at first hand with Lady Margaret's great works there, wrote an elegy in the fashion of the time.

"AN ELEGY

"Upon the funeral of the most serene Princess and Lady, the Lady Margaret, late Countess of Derby, mother to the most puissant King Henry the Seventh: By Skelton, the King's poet laureat, the sixteenth day of August, in the year of our salvation 1516.

"Inspire my elegy, ye sacred nine,
 For pious Margaret mix your tears with mine.
 Within this pile a King's fam'd mother lies;
 Henry, who in yon stately edifice
 In splendor lives with many a noble Peer,
 'Tis his grandparent lies inhumed here.
 Queen Tanquil's exalted mind and birth
 (Whom Livy's pen extols 'bove all on earth),
 Falls short of Marg'ret's; ev'n Penelope
 Was less renowned for chastity than she:
 Prudent as Abigail, King David's wife;
 As Hester bold, in hazarding her life
 To plead her people's cause; resembling three
 The noblest Princesses in history.
 Reader, I pray, whoe'er thou art, thy tears
 For such a Princess offer and thy pray'rs.
 He that defaces, spoils, or takes away
 This script, may Satan snatch him as his prey
 Forthwith, and on him all his rage display.
 Thou great illustrious ruler of the sky,
 Who mad'st the world and reign'st eternally;
 Gracious admit this Princess to thy throne,
 Renown'd for sev'ral virtues, like thy own."

Her tomb of black marble was, like her son's, the work of the great Florentine sculptor, Torrigiano. The recumbent effigy in gilt bronze is considered one of the most beautiful in Westminster Abbey; it represents her in old age in her widow's nunlike garb, and with her hands characteristically clasped in prayer—those "merciful and liberal hands," as Bishop Fisher calls them, so constantly used in giving alms to the poor and needy. An iron railing originally enclosed the tomb; to this Skelton's elegiac verses were attached, but in spite of their concluding prayer, they were taken away during some of the troublous times the Abbey has passed through.

The Countess of Richmond's funeral sermon was preached by her lifelong friend and confessor, Bishop Fisher. From it we gain some idea of her good works, though, as another biographer says, the "notable acts and charitable deeds all her life exercised cannot in a small volume be expressed." The Bishop says of her: "Of marvelous gentleness, she was unto all folks, but especially unto her own whom she trusted and loved right tenderly . . . not forgetful of any kindness or service done to her . . ." She was "of singular wisdom, far passing the common rate of women." . . . "She was bounteous to every person of her knowledge or acquaintance. She was also of singular easiness to be spoken to, and full courteous answer she would make to all that came unto

her. . . . Unkind she would not be unto no creature, nor forgetful of any kindness or service done to her before. . . . Merciful also and piteous she was unto such as were grieved or wrongfully troubled, and to them that were in poverty or sickness or any other misery. To God and to the Church full obedient and tractable, seeking His honor and pleasure." He speaks of her "temperance in meats and drinks," that she "kept fast days diligently and seriously, though not bound on account of age and weaknes," "was houseled full a dozen times a year," which was noticeable, as Holy Communion was not received so frequently at that time. Her hospitality he praised highly, and hospitality included then much more than the entertaining of one's friends. To a person in Lady Margaret's position it often meant receiving travelers who sought lodging for a night or longer, giving shelter, perhaps for a long time, to people of rank or others who had lost all their possessions through the horrors of civil war; housing those who had come with petitions to the King or to have justice done by the Countess herself in her capacity of Lady of the Manor. The Bishop testifies to this form of her activity in the following words: "She procured justice to be administered to suitors, paid learned men to plead their causes; she daily gave lodging, meat and drink and clothing to twelve poor people, in sickness tending them with her own hands" and burying them when they died. No wonder, the Bishop goes on to say, that "all England of her death hath cause of weeping; the poor creatures that were wont to receive her alms . . . the students of both the universities, to whom she was as a mother; all the learned men of England, to whom she was a very patroness; . . . all the noble men and women, to whom she was a mirror, an example of honor; all the common people of this realm, for whom she was in their causes a common mediatrix. . . ."

Bishop Fisher was not a courtier, and his praise must be accepted as a true account of this noble and good woman, more particularly when corroborated by that of her other biographers.

Lady Margaret's will is a wonderful document, giving the most explicit details as to everything he wished done after her death. After bequeathing her soul to "Almighty God and to Our Blessed Lady St. Mary the Virgin and to all the holy company in heaven," she directs that her body is to be buried in the chapel at Westminster, "now begun . . . by our most dear son." She specified all the churches and chapels where Masses were to be offered and prayers to be said, with the number of torches that were to be carried and the offerings that were to be made according to the custom among people of her rank. Her executors were directed

to pay off all her debts "in as goodly haste and brief time as they can," to keep together her household servants for a quarter of a year at least and to pay them their wages for a half year. In addition, those "that had long continued and done to her good service" were to receive part of her goods.

She established three perpetual daily Masses in the monastery of Wetminster; a perpetual chantry in the church of Wimburn, where her parents were buried, with "one perpetual priest to teach grammar freely to all them that will come thereunto perpetually while the world shall endure." All her plate, jewels, vestments and altar hangings, books, etc., not otherwise disposed of, are to be divided equally between the two colleges she founded; she also left to Christ's a number of books, most of which may still be seen in the library of the college. It is touching to see the Countess remembering in the midst of works of almost national importance a pensioner, "Margaret White, anchoress in the House of Nonnes, beside Stamford," and leaving lands to pay for her maintenance and for "an honest woman to attend upon her during her life." Bishop Fox, of Winchester, one of her executors, was to attend to the rewarding of the executors, also to arrange that the number of twelve poor men and women whom she had kept at her manor of Hatfield should be maintained, at her cost, during the remainder of their lives.

Many personal friends are remembered with legacies of plate or a precious book from her valuable collection. One book may seem to us a very insignificant gift from a person of her wealth, but we must remember that books, especially when beautifully bound and decorated with precious metals, as was often done, were really "worth more than their weight in gold." Allowing for the greater purchasing power of money at the end of the fifteenth century, the original cost of an artistic first edition of Caxton or Wynkyn de Worde might easily be several thousand dollars. Lady Margaret's bequest to her son the King, then, of four volumes bound in vellum possessed a high money value apart from their literary and artistic merit. She left him a book of diverse stories in French, "at the beginning the book of Genesis with pictures lymned," "a great volume of vellum covered with black velvet, which is the second volume of Froissart," and the siege of Troy in English; to her half-brother, John St. John, "The Canterbury Tales" in English, and to other friends copies of Gower in English and the *Magna Charta* in French.

A woman biographer of the nineteenth century calls Margaret Beaufort "the brightest ornament of her sex in the fifteenth century." She was indeed cast in a large mould and was great in all

the relations of life. Her greatness of soul she proved by the way she bore both adversity and prosperity; her greatness of mind has a lasting monument in her colleges at Cambridge; of her great warm heart and its power for friendship, let him who knew her best speak. Bishop Fisher says: "Every one that knew her loved her and everything she said or did became her." Catholics of our own time may well be proud of this great and good woman. Her life of strong Catholic faith and social work of a high order contains practical hints for women to-day and should be a source of inspiration even after the lapse of four centuries.

A. S. BAILEY.

London, England.

SHAKESPEARE IN SPAIN.

IN order to avoid heresy, the intercourse between England and Spain was very slight during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This is the reason why nobody then in Spain heard about the author of "Hamlet" and "King Lear," and this explains the failure of Shakespeare to influence the great Castilian dramatic writers, though between him and Lope de Vega "there are points of resemblance which," as Mr. Ticknor remarks, "it is pleasant to trace and difficult to explain, as they and their schools undoubtedly had not the least influence on each other."¹

What the Bostonian critic says about Lope, a contemporary of Shakespeare, a Spanish critic of so great authority as Menéndez y Pelayo says of Calderon, who lived long years afterwards. This famous writer of Spain, after pointing out the great likeness that is found between a passage of Calderon's "Tetrarca de Jerusalem" and Shakespeare's "Othello," assures us that the former "had no knowledge at all of Shakespeare, and perhaps he never heard his name, as was then the case with all the Spaniards in regard to English authors."² We could not say the same thing about the English in regard to the Spaniards, as some of them were acquainted with many writers of Spain, such as Guevara, translated from the French in 1522 by Lord Berners; Valdés, translated in 1638, and Cervantes' "Don Quixote," which was read in England soon after its first appearance in 1604. But these and other Spanish authors were not known by the English directly from Spain, but from Italy, the nation which was at that stage of English literature the dreamland of the English fancy.

¹ "History of Spanish Literature," Vol. II., p. 453. New York, 1854.

² "Calderon y su Teatro," p. 313. Madrid, 1881.

Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was inaccessible to the English, notwithstanding the efforts that were made by many of them, chiefly Protestants, to enter the Peninsular Kingdom, which was then guarded "como a un Parayso terrenal, mediante el Cherubin del Santo Officio," as an earthly paradise by means of the Cherubin of the Holy Inquisition.³ We can find in this the reason why Spain was prevented from sharing in the many shiploads of manuscripts that were sent by Henry VIII. and his successor, as waste paper, to foreign countries, and why she was withheld from the knowledge of our great poets of that age, Milton and Shakespeare. But this careful protection of the Inquisition had the advantage of preserving Spain from the revolt of Luther and of strengthening her fidelity to her glorious faith and to her God.

In the eighteenth century we find the first Spanish writers that knew of the Bard of Avon; some of them, notwithstanding the slavish ideas and uneclectic taste borrowed from France and spread throughout Spain, have given a rather good account of Shakespeare. Yet his great lovers in Spain are to be found in the nineteenth century, when the strong reaction against the French methods began to set in. One of the first Spaniards to speak to his countrymen about the author of "Macbeth" was Leandro Fernandez de Moratin (1760-1828), very well known as a playwright. After extensive travels through Europe, he spent a year in London, whither he went as a pensioner of the Spanish Government to study the English stage. In 1798 he published a prose translation of "Hamlet," "which offended his academic theories in every scene."⁴ The French influence that mastered Leandro and his love for Molière, who was his ideal, and Racine, whom he considered superior to Shakespeare, led him into many misjudgments and misinterpretations. These have been brought forth by the Jesuit José Aicardo,⁵ who remarks that many things which Moratin blames in the notes to his translation of Shakespeare he praises in the introduction to his own comedies. His "Hamlet" is faithful even in the details and better worked out than the Abate Clodera thought it to be. Moratin's opinion of the play is that of a "great work, interesting and tragic, fit to kindle any fancy and fill any audience with fear and trembling."⁶ There is no doubt that if Moratin had not first fallen

³ Francisco de Pisa in his "Descripción de Toledo," Book I, chap. 25. Much has been written about the English in Spain during the time of Henry VIII. and his successor. *Cfr.* Menéndez y Delayo, "Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles;" Dr. McCrie, "History of Reformation in Spain."

⁴ Fitzmaurice-Kelly, "A History of Spanish Literature," p. 361. New York, 1910.

⁵ "Razón y Fé," Vol. II, pp. 271-2.

⁶ "Obras de D. Nicolás y Leandro de Moratín," Vol. II, pp. 556-7. "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles de Rivadeneira."

worshiper to the literary spirit of France, with its rigid adherence to classical models, he would, according to his talent, have given a rather good appreciation of Shakespeare, instead of deeming him "distinctly inferior to Racine; for such is the conclusion at which Moratin arrived in his critical estimate of the work with which he dealt."⁷

Many years before Leandro gave his version to the press the learned Jesuit, Esteban de Arteaga, who may be called the Spanish Lessing, no less for his sound judgment in all æsthetic matters than for his having been the first Spaniard to speak authoritatively to Spain of the great genius of Shakespeare, had made a study on the uncommon and unparalleled qualities of the great English master. In one of his works which deals with "Philosophical Researches on Ideal Beauty" he speaks in these terms of the poet of Avon: "His pen portrayed the feelings and genius of men with such vividness that one fancies that it is not allowed to human ability to go beyond. . . . His exuberance excites wonder, no less than the great variety of his portraits, which are never thrown into confusion; but one and all reveal a power of description which surpasses that of other poets, with this difference, however, that others add to their pen-pictures a great deal of imagination, while Shakespeare seems to be the translator of Nature, appointed by her to be the looking-glass where even her most indistinguishable movements can be seen."⁸ Such is an estimate of one of the most learned men that appeared in Europe during the eighteenth century. He sums up his appreciation by affirming that Shakespeare is a great deal more original and copious than the French poets.

A friend of Arteaga was the famous Abate Juan Andrés, recognized as the founder of the "History of Literature," which he wrote and published at intervals from 1782 to 1799. It is, as Mr. Hallam says, "an extraordinary performance, embracing both ancient and modern literature in its full extent."⁹ Andrés is very unfair in his judgment on English writers, as may be seen by his disparaging criticisms of Milton and Shakespeare. In criticizing Shakespeare he seems to follow, to a great extent, the opinions of Voltaire, as, for example, when he foolishly censures the great poet for the gravediggers in "Hamlet." After having quoted some praises be-

⁷ Mr. J. D. Ford in his interesting paper on the "English Influence Upon Spanish Literature in the Early Part of the Nineteenth Century," published in the "Publications of the Modern Language Association of America," Vol. XVI., No. 3.

⁸ Esteban de Arteaga, "Investigaciones filosóficas sobre la Belleza Ideal," Madrid, 1789. This book, slender in quantity, but excellent in quality, is for the poet and lover of poetry what Balmes' "Art of Thinking" is for the philosopher. Both books deserve wider recognition.

⁹ "Introduction to the Literature of Europe." Preface.

stowed on Shakespeare by Jones, Sherlock and other English writers, Andrés makes the following statement: "I do not find in the works of Shakespeare that beauty so much boasted of, and even if it were in his works, I believe it would be better to pass it by than have to find it amidst so much trash. Let anybody read the passages so highly praised by Pope, and even the very sense of Antonio praised by Sherlock, and tell us freely whether the few pathetic and eloquent phrases there found can bear comparison with the constant strain of foolishness that deforms all the play."¹⁰ He tells us that if we wish to know who Shakespeare is, we ought to read him in English, since the original is worse than the translations. It is hard to understand how so learned a man as Andrés could be guilty of such blundering comment. But when we understand that only a few privileged minds were sufficiently free from the corrupted taste of the French school to grasp the merits of the great English poet, we are not surprised to find the majority of his Spanish critics of the eighteenth century led far astray. Many of those are to be mentioned here before we reach the great modern Shakespearean devotees. One of the former is Joseph Marchena, a constant admirer of Voltaire and an advocate of his irreligious tenets. His opinion of Shakespeare was as erroneous as his judgment of the best Spanish writers. A man who says that Juan de Avila and Luis de Granada are "titires espirituales" affords us amusement rather than resentment when he characterizes the writings of Shakespeare as "a garbage heap of the most loathsome barbarity."¹¹ Marchena never knew Shakespeare in the original; his knowledge was drawn from the French versions of Ducis and Le-tourner, most incompetent to give an adequate account of the poet's merits.

In the footsteps of Marchena followed his contemporary, José de Cadalso y Vasquez (1741-1782).¹² He ridicules the turgid style of Racine's "Phedra" as well as "the atrocities that Shakespeare brought upon the English stage." Cadalso's criticism was challenged by his contemporary, Sempere y Guarinos, who quotes his words and shows their absurdity.¹³

No less absurd is the judgment of Dr. Manuel M. de Marmol, who, in a lecture given at Seville in 1833, speaks of Shakespeare as a dreamer might. "How many dramatic writers," he exclaims,

¹⁰ "Dell' origine, progresso e stato attuale d'ogni letteratura," Vol. VI, p. 4. Venezia, 1788.

¹¹ These critical appreciations are taken from his "Lecciones" on literature.

¹² "Los Eruditos a la violeta," or "Fashionable Learning," was published in 1772.

¹³ "Biblioteca de escritores del Reinado de Carlos III.," Vol. II, p. 23.

"are thought to be worth more, even among the English and by all the learned men of the world, than the prodigious author of 'Hamlet'" [sic!]¹⁴ Together with this writer, we may quote Gomez Hermosilla, who in his "Arte de Hablar" [an inadequate plagiarism of Blair's "Poetry and Rhetoric"] affirms that "with skill, but without proper instruction and rules, we may compose the sometimes sublime, but always monstrous plays of Shakespeare."¹⁵

Greater sagacity and learning was shown by Solís. In spite of his academic theories, he admired Shakespeare and translated both "Hamlet" and "Romeo and Juliet," not indeed from the original, but from the French of Laplace and Letourner. No wonder, then, Shakespeare, as the Spaniards knew him through Solís, is so changed and distorted that one who knew the original would be convinced they were not translations, but parodies. Yet such as they were, the reception given to them when performed on the Spanish stage was most favorable. His "Romeo and Juliet," translated into harmonious verse, appeared in 1829 at Barcelona.¹⁶

Eighteen years after Solís published his versions and had seen them performed on the stage with success, as we have already mentioned, another poet published a translation of Shakespeare's "Macbeth." This was Joseph Garcia de Villalta, a man of sound judgment and in possession of no little poetic ability. But the public of Madrid, who enjoyed and praised the insipid and even ridiculous French plays that were performed in the Teatro del Principe, evidenced their lack of appreciation by hissing the immortal drama of Shakespeare, so carefully translated by Villalta.¹⁷

Mariano José de Larra (1809-1837), though educated in France, never permitted his mind to be narrowed by French theories, but always admired the extraordinary genius of our great dramatic writer. Larra in one of his critical essays,¹⁸ in which he declares that the genius of great men does not appear so much in their ability to say new things, but in saying and doing the common ones in an uncommon way, asks: "What is a lover but a being we find in every intrigue of love and one that has been put on the stage by hundreds of dramatists? But why is it that only *Othello*, only the lover of Shakespeare's play, has traversed the course of time and has been performed in all the theatres of the world?"

A friend of Larra and a constant admirer of Shakespeare was

¹⁴ "Discurso pronunciado en la Academia de Buenas Letras de Sevilla," 1833.

¹⁵ "Arte de Hablar," Vol. II., p. 264. Madrid, 1839.

¹⁶ Menéndez y Pelayo, in his "Ideas Estéticas en España," and Fr. García Blanco, in his "Historia de la Literatura Española en el siglo diez y nueve," give this account of Solís' works on Shakespeare.

¹⁷ García Blanco, *op. cit.*, Vol. I., p. 251.

¹⁸ In his criticism of Hartzenbusch's play, "Los Amantes de Teruel."

Donoso Cortés, one of the greatest orators that Europe heard during the last century. Speaking about the great Spanish poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who commonly were not original, but imitators of the poets of Greece and Rome, he exclaims: "And in what century did that happen? In that century in which Tasso sings the praises of Bouillon and Tancredo, in which Shakespeare made the sword of Melpomene flash on the stage of England with a resplendence that will last as long as his name, as long as the world. In vain you will seek another author endowed with such profound knowledge of the human heart or a painter of such dreadful reality in the presentation of great characters: Shakespeare will be always the despair of those who dare to imitate him."¹⁹ Donoso Cortés closes the first half of the last century, wherein so few worthy appreciations of our great poet are to be found. As we advance towards our own age the best Shakespeare critics of Spain begin to appear.

One of those is Pedro Antonio de Alarcón (1833-1891), who as a poet and prose writer ranks among the best authors that Spain possessed in modern times. Alarcón in a sane lecture on morality in artistic matters speaks thus of the English tragedian: "Nobody denies that giant to be the greatest dramatic writer of the universe. And what was he in purity? An artist that only cared for exterior form? A mechanical worker whose only employment is to unite one lively painting to another, subverting all truth and regarding only the effect to be produced and the cries of terror to be brought forth from the listeners? . . . Ah, no! His genius is based on better ground. His plays are the mirror of life and the autopsy of the conscience. When *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, *Gloucester* move or act, the spectator thinks that he approaches the abysses of the soul and sees there the first springs of the passions, the hidden fountains of the good and evil, the cavern where crime is generated, the unknown lake where the tears unite, the strong rock where virtue crystallizes, the boiling lava that makes the earth tremble. . . . Every wish and every passion, every act of heroism and every fault has at its side an angel or a devil, its reward or its punishment. The sting of conscience is the horrible Fury which the author unchains against the guilty. God, full of mercy, is always in the play, consoling the just with the peace of conscience. This is why Shakespeare's plays are so pleasant and so edifying in the midst of their terrors. Heaven is the end of all. There *Desdemona*, the innocent victim of the *Moor*, triumphs; there is *Antonio*, the debtor of the Jew; there the lovers of Venice; there

¹⁹ "Obras de Donoso Cortés," Vol. I., p. 23. Madrid, 1854.

²⁰ "Discurso de recepción en la Academia," pp. 36-37. Madrid, 1877.

Ophelia; there the sons of Edward; there *King Lear*, a second Laocoon, tormented not by serpents, but by his unfaithful daughters."²⁰ Alarcón was indeed a great lover of Shakespeare. His criticism shows a fine intelligence of Shakespeare's genius, a vast knowledge of the plays and a keen, judicious appreciation of all their beauties.

It seems that Alarcón imparted this same love and knowledge of Shakespeare to his friend, Manuel Tamayo y Baus (1828-1898), the greatest Spanish dramatic writer of modern times. His plays, "Lances de Honor," "Los Hombres de bien" and "Un Drama Nuevo," are masterpieces. In this last, which is "the most ambitious and unquestionably the best of his plays,"²¹ he introduces Shakespeare as one of the *dramatis personæ*, and he plays his rôle so admirably and his part is so rich in dramatic creation that Shakespeare himself would undoubtedly class it with his own "Macbeth" and "King Lear." The beginning of "Un Drama Nuevo" is as follows:

(House of Yorick. Shakespeare with manuscript in his hand enters front door. Yorick accompanies him.)

Shakespeare. Tell me—why have you brought me to your house?

Yorick. Perhaps you'd prefer not to have come?

Sh. By no means. You know I deem your invitation a favor.

Yor. Then why are you so eager to leave?

Sh. I left the company of many illustrious persons to answer your summons, and it would be discourteous of me to keep them waiting over long, since they have come from afar to hold converse with me.

Yor. Your guests shall be appeased by some Spanish wine which I will send without delay. Tell them that this wine has power to raise the dead to life. And will it not be a wonderful sight to behold the dead monarchs of England raised to life in one assemblage, and each one disputing his rival's claim to the throne? But can they be brought to life more certainly than some of them have been already by your pen?

Sh. But, come now, tell me, what is it you wish?

Yor. What more can I wish than to glory in my joy of having in my house the remarkable poet, the great Shakespeare, the glory and boast of England?

Tamayo in one of his literary lectures declares that the creation of the modern stage "was the enterprise of the two great priests of our Spain and of the most mighty Shakespeare, three geniuses endowed with so great imaginative powers, such sensitive hearts and such lofty spirits that it seems they were born only for that purpose."²² Mr. Boris de Tannenberg in his book, "L'Espagne Littéraire," declares that perhaps Tamayo's love for Shakespeare passed beyond due bounds.

Tamayo Baus has had the fortune of a good biographer, Sr. Siscars y Salvadó, who has written the life of his friend with affectionate interest and biographic tact, a combination rarely displayed in the written lives of men of letters. Siscars y Salvadó, in speaking of Tamayo's love towards Shakespeare, shows us in a

²¹ Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

²² "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia de la Lengua." Edición de la Academia, Vol. II., p. 275.

simple, unaffected way his own admiration for our great English playwright: "Tamayo had special skill in painting and sculpturing female characters. In this he resembles Shakespeare, Lope de Vega, Goethe, Garcia, Gutierrez and Bretón de los Herreros. The first was truly a great creator of characters. In that artistic gallery where we find *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Romeo*, *Shylock*, *Iago* and many others, we find also *Ophelia*, *Desdemona*, *Juliet*, *Lady Macbeth*, all of them splendid creations of female persons."²³ Some pages further on he writes: "Very well does our poet [Tamayo] tell us that Shakespeare, the most universal, the most original and human of dramatic writers, has scarcely any play in which there is not some imitation of other authors, and sometimes his powerful genius takes the whole fact from the chronicles and puts it on the stage with accuracy of detail and vividness of portrayal."²⁴

In the last period of the nineteenth century the Island of Mallorca gave to Spanish literature two men of great talent and vast erudition: Tomás Aguiló and José Maria Quadrado. Both of them were great admirers of Shakespeare. Aguiló always held in high esteem three great poets of England: Milton, whom he imitated in his "Abdiél y los Siglos ante Jesucristo;" Byron, whose Hebrew melodies he translated; and Shakespeare, whose plays he used to read constantly and with that feeling of veneration which one is conscious of when conversing with great men. His "Articulos Literarios"²⁵ and, in fact, all his writings show evidences of this veneration of poet for poet. Quadrado shared this veneration, and he translated, or, more properly speaking, imitated, Shakespeare's "Macbeth," "King Lear" and "Measure for Measure," and these plays he published under the same titles, declaring that he only wanted to cast them in a new form. They are dramatic; they show much labor and careful work, but generally they are but poor counterparts of the genius of the original. Menéndez y Pelayo has given a good appreciation of what he styles "refundiciones" of Quadrado.²⁶

With Quadrado and Aguiló we may mention D. Manuel Milá y Fontanals, who in his study on Calderon's "Principe Constante" and in his unrivaled book on "Æsthetics" has given a brief but clever appreciation of Shakespeare's genius. From the "Æsthetics" we quote the following:²⁷

²³ "Tamayo y Baños," p. 105.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

²⁵ "Obras completas de D. Tomas Aguiló," Vol. VI., 1883.

²⁶ "Estudios de Crítica literaria," Vol. V., p. 69.

²⁷ "Tratado de Estética," p. 252. Barcelona, 1888. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly in his bigoted "History of Spanish Literature" overlooks this great writer of Spain, as well as many others of high merit, such as Amos Escalante, V. Querol, C. Nosedal, R. Nosedal, Navarro Villoslada, Ortí y Lara and Juan Mir y Noguera, one of the most learned and prolific writers of modern Spain.

"In spite of the manifold irregularities of his diction and of the very evident inequalities of his genius shown now by the work of a master mind, now alternating to that of a mediocre dramatist, nobody has surpassed Shakespeare in richness and power of imagination; nobody has set forth with more profound knowledge, more certainty and more poetic attractiveness the mysteries of the human heart. This is not to say that the reading of his work is always profitable and edifying; for Shakespeare's dramas extend over the whole range of human action, and his world of life embraces everything from the most low and vulgar to the highest and noblest." As we might expect Mila would not confine his opinion on the morality of Shakespeare to a written book, but we have been assured by some of his own pupils that he constantly insisted on this point.

Finally, in the last part of the nineteenth century several good translations of Shakespeare, together with some studies on his works, found favor throughout Spain.

The best poetic translation is that of Macpherson, a Spaniard of English descent, who published the works of Shakespeare, in several volumes. Macpherson's renditions are true, ingenious, and they constitute at present the best Spanish translation of Shakespeare's plays. A long and learned preface was published with Macpherson's version. Its author is D. Eduardo Benot, a writer well acquainted with English literature. Besides a biography full of the most minute details, Benot quotes the praises bestowed on Shakespeare by all the chief writers of England. His own appreciation of Shakespeare is given thus: "Shakespeare did not study the conventional literature of the classics in the English universities; but his inborn power of observation made of him the interpreter of Nature, the decipherer of the riddles of the heart. . . . His genius subdued all the powers of the passions; and in sculpturesque groups of incomparable beauty he presented them to the amazed world, that they might not only be the wonder of his own country, but also the charm and marvel of all ages."²⁸ Much of Benot's work bears a favorable comparison with the best parts of Coleridge's. Both writers have been instrumental in bringing to light many new thoughts, new ideas, new aspects, which even to the most diligent readers had formerly remained secret—beauties hidden by beauties.

Another translation of Shakespeare was made by D. Jaime Clark and published with a preface written by D. Juan Valera (1822-1905). Some good ideas may be gleaned from the many errors and ridiculous assertions contained in this preface.²⁹ Valera begins

²⁸ Preface, p. 154.

²⁹ Published also in his "Nuevos Estudios Críticos."

one of his paragraphs by asking: "What can I add to the praises bestowed upon Shakespeare, in Germany, by Wieland, the two Schegels, by Lessing and by many others who proclaim him to be the greatest of dramatic writers and the fountain-head from which the modern dramatists of Germany have derived their beautiful inspirations? How can I speak, how can I write about Shakespeare after the eulogy pronounced by Victor Hugo, a eulogy which is a gigantic monument, a series of huge dithyrambs, a colossal statue wrought in an imagination of fire with an enthusiasm that knows no limits, a statue afterwards smoothed and brightened by a diamond chisel? How can I dare to open my lips or permit my pen to go on after reading the beautiful apotheosis, the sublime greeting which Emerson sends Shakespeare from the other side of the Atlantic?" Notwithstanding all this, Valera deems Shakespeare inferior to Cervantes, to Lope de Vega and perhaps to Tirso de Molina; but he gives us to understand, however, that Shakespeare, ranked with such compeers, still remains very high in the opinion of the Spaniards; "as I put him, if not as high as Cervantes, on the same level with Calderon and near to Lope."³⁰ He finds that the characters of Cervantes are more original than those of Shakespeare. Not long afterwards he assures us that *Ophelia*, *Desdemona*, *Juliet*, *Miranda*, *Beatrice*, *Hero*, *Lady Macbeth*, *Othello* and *Hamlet* are kept in the mind of mankind with stronger firmness and consistency than the names of the most famous and renowned historical personages. . . . Shakespeare's heroes are stored with the elixir of eternal life and youth." In another work, speaking of Shakespeare's poetical qualities, Valera goes so far as to deny that true realism is to be found in his plays. "Nothing is more ideal, more remote from what happens every day, sometimes remote from the natural and possible, than what Shakespeare has written."³¹ As a proof of what he says, he quotes an article of Vernon Lee (published many years ago in the *Contemporary Review*, where there are ideas which no student of Shakespeare will admit. Valera himself seems to profess the contrary when he writes: "The heroes of Shakespeare, some of Calderon, nearly all of Cervantes' and not a few other poets, have their proper individuality, they have a soul that belongs to them."³² If the characters of Shakespeare's

³⁰ Valera, like many other Spaniards, has been too lavish in his praises of Cervantes. We admire the many good gifts of the author of *Don Quixote*, but even in the Spanish literature there are at least half a dozen writers of more genius, talent, richness of style and elocution than Cervantes. Not only Lope de Vega and Calderon, but Cabrera, Acosta, Granada, Nieremberg, the historian Coloma and the matchless Fr. Luis de León rank higher than the author of "*Don Quixote*."

³¹ "Apuntes sobre el nuevo arte de escribir novelas; Obras completas," Vol. III., p. 202.

³² "Estudios críticos," Vol. III., p. 104.

plays are so far removed from reality, so different from ordinary characters, how can they have a soul that belongs to them? This is the character of Valera's writings. He is in matters of criticism what D. Emilio Castelar was in history. It mattered little that he contradicted his statement of yesterday, provided that to-day's argument suited his purpose. His parallel between Lope de Vega and Shakespeare is as poetical as untrue:³³ "Beautiful and deep appears the Lake of Ginebra; but the lake is insignificant if I compare it with the greatness and unmeasurable depth of the wide ocean. So I think sometimes, and may God forgive my patriotic vanity if I fall into error, that Shakespeare is the lake and Lope de Vega the ocean, greater than the former in quality and quantity."

Many modern writers of Spain are to be mentioned among the Shakespeareans. The Jesuit José M. Aicardo, in many of his studies on Lope de Vega,³⁴ has shown his admiration for the great English playwright; so also Menéndez y Pidal in some of his works, chiefly in his excellent study on "El Condenado por Desconfiado" of Tirso de Molina. Sr. José de Echegaray is also an admirer and lover of Shakespeare.³⁵

But Spain's greatest lover of Shakespeare is D. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo. He has not written any special work on the author of "Othello," but we may say that all his works contain expressions of love for him. He tells us that "the art of Shakespeare is admired and adored by all the nations of the world," and the reason is because "he uses the true language of nature amidst the passions."³⁶ Shakespeare "had pierced by intuition into the spirit of antiquity, describing, for instance, the Roman populace of the time of Julius Cæsar as neither the French tragedians nor Alfieri ever did, in spite of their having made a closer study of antiquity."³⁷ Menéndez quotes with pleasure the words of Lessing about one of Shakespeare's plays: "I know only one drama in which Love placed her hand, and that one is 'Romeo and Juliet.'" Of "Othello" he writes that "the jealousies of *Othello* are doubtless brutal and harsh in their origin and in their development; but that is the reason why they are thoroughly human . . . it is the passion such as it comes forth in any person who is truly passionate and adores a woman."³⁸ "Shakespeare's style is not a secure and unspotted

³³ "Ecos Argentinos," p. 328. Valera has written on Shakespeare in many other places, as in his "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia," p. 329; "Estudios Críticos," Vol. III., p. 117.

³⁴ These studies, giving proof of profound admiration, have been published in the Spanish review, "Razón Fé," 1903, Vols. IV., V.

³⁵ "Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia," 20th of May, 1894.

³⁶ "Ideas Estéticas," Vol. V., pp. 162, 270, 289, 225.

³⁷ "Calderón y su Teatro," p. 187.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

one, but his faults are not like those of Calderon. Shakespeare in the real tragic circumstances uses the most simple, most natural and unique expression that ought to be used then and there."³⁹ About the moral character of Shakespeare he writes that it is not exempt from blame, as happens likewise in the case of Lope de Vega; "nevertheless, both of them are the greatest dramatic writers that ever existed."⁴⁰ In regard to the English and Spanish stage, Menéndez y Pelayo is of the opinion that the Spanish is next to the English one in greatness and "superior to it in richness and national spirit."⁴¹ His appreciation of the Spanish dramatic writers and of Shakespeare is given in these lines which he wrote many years ago: "Our writers very seldom showed that power of psychological observation, that deep intuition of the mysteries of the soul, that patient, detailed analysis of the secret powers which spur man to deeds of heroism or steep him in vice, that wonderful psychological faculty which united and combined with a power of imagination in no lower degree, places on so high a level the creations of Shakespeare."⁴² Speaking of the imitations of Shakespeare made by Quadrado, he says that "they are a new manner of showing the love joined with veneration and astonishment which Quadrado, as all the great writers, have had towards that king of the stage whose genius seems to be presage of a future human race superior to the one we know."⁴³ Without doubt, Menéndez y Pelayo is the greatest Shakespearean scholar Spain has had. Besides his critiques, he translated, in excellent manner, many of Shakespeare's plays. His name heads the glorious series where Arteaga, Donoso Cortés, Alarcón, Quadrado, Tamayo y Baus and Benot are found. Much more could be cited from Menéndez, as nearly all his books afford us matter on this subject, but we may close the citations by applying to him the phrases which he himself has written about Hegel: "What beautiful pages on 'Macbeth' and 'Hamlet!' Only to the great it is permitted to understand and feel the great writers and thus express their admiration towards them."⁴⁴

A word remains to be said about some Shakespearean students in Catalonia and of the South American republics. The chief of the Catalonian admirers of Shakespeare are Guimerá, who imitated him in some of his plays, and A. Masriera, who has translated with great felicity the best plays of Shakespeare into the Catalan lan-

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

⁴⁰ In a letter to Leopoldo Rius y Llorellas, "*Crítica literaria*," Vol. IV., p. 113.

⁴¹ "*Crítica literaria*," Vol. IV., p. 117.

⁴² El Alcalde de Zalamea in the "*Obras completas de Lope de Vega*."

⁴³ "*Crítica literaria*," Quadrado, p. 69.

⁴⁴ "*Ideas Estéticas*," Vol. IV., p. 327.

guage and has highly praised his admirable qualities.⁴⁶ Verdaguér, who is one of the greatest of Spanish poets, also admired Shakespeare, and indeed the lofty characters of his "Canigó" are Shakespearean.

In the literature of the South American republics the greatest lover and admirer of Shakespeare is the author of the "Tabaré," Sr. Zorrilla de San Martín; he has written a long article on the English playwright which does not fall far short of the best that have been written in the Spanish language. In Mexico we find Arango y Escandón; in Venezuela Andrés Bello; and in Chile Guillermo Junemann, all three Shakespeareans, chiefly the latter who has written a comprehensive study of the English dramatist.⁴⁶ And in the Argentine Republic we name among others Ventura de la Vega, who imitated Shakespeare in his "Julio Cesar," as did Dr. David Peña in some of his plays.

This is not, on any count, a complete enumeration of the Shakespearean critics in South America, nor of the Spanish works, whether at home or abroad, which treat of Shakespeare. In a fuller list we would instance Luzán, Quintana, Martínez de la Rosa, who, by the way, came to change his ideas on dramatic literature after his study in the English dramatist;⁴⁷ Herrera Bustamante, Carlos Coello, Gallardo, T. La Calle, Pedro Estala, J. N. Bohl de Faber, Hartzenbusch, A. Rubió y Ors, B. Aribau, Coll y Vehi, whose "Dialogos Literarios" are filled with praises of the Bard of Avon; Nunez de Arce, who admirably paraphrased *Hamlet's* soliloquy, and finally, J. Benavente, named for his excellent translation of "King Lear."

These, therefore, and the native Spanish writers whom we have cited are sufficient testimony to show that the literary students of Spain sing no small part in the great chorus of the nations to the unique genius of the "immortal William."

WILLIAM FURLONG, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

⁴⁶ In his masterly study on Calderon, published in the "Enciclopedia Espasa," Vol. X., p. 659, Barcelona, 1911, he gives a very good appreciation of Shakespeare.

⁴⁶ "Historia de la Literatura," pp. 277-8.

⁴⁷ Menéndez y Pelayo, "Crítica Literaria," primera serie, Vol. I., p. 270.

THE PUTUMAYO ATROCITIES.

STEAMING up the Amazon beyond Manaos, the great rubber port of Brazil, and continuing the westward journey on the Upper Amazon, or Marañon, one reaches the Peruvian port of Iquitos, in the Province of Loreto.

It is through this port that the commerce of Peru flows to and from the Atlantic. Iquitos is situated north of the point where the Amazon receives the Ucayali, that affords access to the interior of the country on the south. West of Iquitos lies the great forest region known as the Montaña. Returning down the Amazon from Iquitos, you reach the Putumayo or Ica, an affluent of the Amazon, a thousand miles long, streaming in a southeasterly direction. The rubber country of which there is question, when we speak of the Putumayo atrocities, lies northeast of this river in the district bordering on two of its affluents, the Igaraparaná and Caraparaná. These two rivers originate near the watershed of the Japurá, another tributary of the Amazon, further east. Running parallel in a southwesterly direction, for some 300 or 400 miles, they end in the Putumayo, the Caraparaná, 600, and the Igaraparaná, about 400 miles above its junction with the Amazon. This region is bordered on the west by Ecuador, on the north by Colombia, on the south by Peru and on the east by Brazil. It is disputed territory, as it is claimed by Peru and by Colombia.

Colombia has recently reasserted its claim in a joint resolution, passed by both houses of Congress. The action of the Governments of England and the United States in calling upon Peru to put an end to the atrocities is said to rest on the "erroneous belief that Peru has sovereignty over the regions which have been the theatre of these crimes." Colombia affirms its legal right to be the only sovereign of the Caquetá and Putumayo and their affluents, of which it has been despoiled, while had she been able to exercise said sovereignty, the atrocities would never have occurred.

The district contains an approximate area of 10,000 square miles between the equator and the second degree of south latitude and the 72d and 74th of west longitude. The Igaraparaná is navigable for vessels of 100 tons to a point 220 miles from its mouth, where is situated La Chorrera, the principal rubber depot. The most important station on the Caraparaná, the smaller of the two rivers, is at El Encanto, near its junction with the Putumayo.

A native Indian population dwells on these two rivers, which, a few years ago, the Peruvian authorities estimated at from forty to fifty thousand souls. The majority of these natives dwelt on the Igaraparaná. The largest tribe was that of the Huitotos, between

the Middle and Upper Igaraparaná and the Caraparaná and north of the former toward the Japurá or Caquetá. Northeast of these lived the Andokes, Ricigaros and Boras, all of a different language. These tribes were divided into a number of subtribes or families, ruled by their hereditary caciques or captains, while they were, more often than not, at war with each other, their divisions rendering them an easy prey to the invader. The Huitotos are described as a mild and inoffensive people. Owing to the exactions of the whites and the cruelty practiced on the natives, this population has immensely diminished, being threatened with complete extinction.

As gold and land, exciting the cupidity of the colonizers, gradually decimated the Indian population in North and South America, thus in these latter years rubber has become their bane in the great basin of the Amazon. The twentieth century "conquistadores," in their exploitations of this most profitable article of commerce, did, as their sixteenth century predecessors had done before them, exploited the Indian, in order to exploit the rubber, and without any title whatsoever, save that of occupation, took possession of the forest and of its inhabitants. Forming themselves into bands and parties, under the designation of commercial associations, they enslaved the natives and forced them to work rubber for them, while any encroachment by a rival company, any theft of Indians, was followed by bloody reprisals.

By the end of the year 1904 a number of minor companies, most of them Colombians, were operating on the Putumayo, some apparently by concession of the Colombian Government. The firm of Arana Brothers at Iquitos served as intermediaries for these companies, supplying their wants and disposing of their rubber in the Iquitos market. Gradually Arana Brothers bought out the smaller companies or obtained possession of them by other means, until they almost acquired a monopoly of the rubber traffic on the Putumayo.

The system of "peonage" that prevails throughout the greater part of the Amazonian rubber region is rank injustice and slavery and facilitates the eating up of smaller concerns by larger ones. The employer gets a person, Indian or white, the latter being perhaps himself an exploiter of rubber labor, into his debt. The unfortunate debtor, unable to meet his obligations, becomes hopelessly involved, like a fly in the spider's web. Unable to pay, he is forced to work for his creditor upon the latter's terms, and often becomes his slave. A small capitalist or trader will, by accumulated obligations, thus see his business pass into the hands of his creditor, while he himself becomes a mere employee or worse.

At the period of which I am writing, the close of the year 1904,

a new element entered into the rubber industry on the Putumayo. The firm of Arana Brothers contracted with over two hundred Barbados Negroes in this and the following year for a term of two years, the first party to arrive consisting of thirty men and two women. On their arrival they found that the duties imposed upon them would be of an entirely different nature from those for which they had contracted. On landing at La Chorrera, the station on the Igaraparaná, they were armed with Winchester rifles and cartridges, and sent out into the forest to open up trade relations with the Andokes; in other words, to capture Indians and compel them to work rubber. Here begins a chapter of horrors of which we catch the first glimpse and to which we return.

Not all the Barbados men, however, were sent to the Putumayo, a certain number being employed in agricultural labors on the estate Nanai, near Iquitos, and others in divers occupations.

This state of affairs continued until the latter part of 1907, when the firm of Arana Brothers became a British company, with headquarters in London, as the Peruvian Amazon Rubber Company, Limited, a name that was subsequently changed to the Peruvian Amazon Company, Limited. The new company assumed the responsibilities of Arana Brothers.

Under the working of this company, as well as of its predecessor, several classes of persons have to be distinguished. First, there were the directors, either at London or Iquitos, then the agents at the stations on the rivers, with their subordinates, nearly all men with Spanish names, Peruvian, Bolivian or Colombian; further, the Barbados workmen, and finally the Indian population. The chief agents received a commission on the amount of rubber forwarded to Iquitos, and it was, therefore, to their advantage to obtain as much rubber as possible. The Barbados men were, to a great extent, employed as Indian catchers, or as executioners of punishment. The members of the salaried staff of an agency or station were known as "rationales." Besides these, each station possessed also a staff of Indian "muchachos," some of whom had grown up on the agency. These demoralized youngsters, armed with Winchesters, were employed in the catching of runaway Indians, and their hands were red with blood.

By means of these various instruments Arana Brothers and their successor, the Peruvian Amazon Company, extracted labor from the indigenous population, and the outside world remained ignorant of the horrors concealed beneath the thick foliage of primeval forests. However, these gradually leaked out, either by correspondence or by the report of those who returned from the dark regions of the forest.

Some of the earliest complaints came from the ecclesiastical authorities to the Government of Peru, while they, of course, sent their regular reports to their superiors in Rome. Iquitos and the Lower Putumayo are situated in the Apostolic Prefecture of Amazonas. On the upper waters of the Putumayo Colombian settlers had established religious centres, but their influence seems never to have penetrated to the Indians. In 1907 the Prefect Apostolic of Amazonas wrote to the Minister of Justice that it was not possible to establish any mission on the Putumayo, owing to the abuses of the rubber gatherers against the Indians, seizing their women and children. He had himself visited the Yaguas on foot, and in 1903 a mission had been established among them on the Ampiyaco. The "caucheros" (rubber men) obstructed the labors of the missionaries, being "interested that the savages should remain in the grossest ignorance, in order to exploit them with the greater ease." The Apostolic Prefect of the Ucayali writes to the Minister of Justice that in his region, in spite of the prohibitions of the Government, boys and girls are sold as slaves, and raids are made upon the Indians, numbers of whom are killed. Though acknowledging the beneficent labors of the missionaries, the Government seems to have taken no steps to remedy the abuses, at least on the Putumayo. The district north of this river remained a kind of no man's land, with little or no constituted legal or executive authority, so that the "caucheros" had full sway.

In the meantime reports began to circulate abroad, the British press took up the matter, and the attention of the world was finally attracted to the Putumayo horrors. The revelations came late, but they came at last to open the eyes of civilized man to the excesses perpetrated in the name of a British company.

Affidavits were taken from persons who had been eyewitnesses of the tragic scenes of the Putumayo regions, and they were published to the world. Articles began to appear in London in "The Truth," the "Daily News" and in other papers, as well as in publications elsewhere. The London Anti-slavery Society for the Protection of Aborigines took up and pushed the matter, moving the British Government to initiate an investigation.

Last year the Colombian writer, Vicente Olarte Camacho, published at Bogotá a work on the Putumayo cruelties, with an array of astounding facts derived from authentic documents.

The authorities in Rome set on foot a quiet investigation of their own, the result of which is given in the Encyclical of Pope Pius X., dated June 7, 1912, and addressed to the Bishops of Latin America. The following passage gives us an idea of some of the barbarities perpetrated:

"What indeed is so cruel and so barbarous as for reasons often trivial and not rarely for the mere pleasure of inflicting torture to put men to death by scourging or with red-hot irons; or suddenly attacking them, to massacre them, killing hundreds and thousands of them together; or to sack towns and villages, slaughtering the natives, of whom within these past few years some tribes have, we learn, been almost exterminated."

This is indeed a sad picture, almost beyond belief, but when we enter into the details of the British investigation our blood curdles. This investigation was set on foot by a letter from the Foreign Office to Sir Roger Casement, Consul General at Rio de Janeiro, informing him of his being chosen to accompany a commission of inquiry appointed by the Peruvian Amazon Company. The letter is dated July 21, 1910. The object of the commission was to inquire into the possibilities of commercial development of the company's properties and into the present relations between the native employees and the agents of the company. Sir Roger Casement was directed to report on the condition of British subjects and, secondly, on the treatment of the natives by the employees of the company.

Casement left England on July 23, 1910, and arrived at Manaus on August 16. The following day he proceeded to Iquitos, where he arrived on the 31st, to remain there until the 14th of September, when he embarked for the Putumayo, arriving at La Chorrera station on the 22d. He remained on the Putumayo, either at La Chorrera or in the outstations, until November 16. During that time he saw all the British subjects in the company's employ; a number of them were put through formal and complete interrogatories, and it is upon their united testimony that his report is based.

From the reports of the Consul General we learn that several times the British employees of the company were submitted to criminal ill treatment, and, among other things, that the burden of feeding the majority of the employees largely rested upon the native population, who were compelled by illegal force to labor in a variety of ways for the profit of the company. This compulsion was frequently accompanied by gross outrages, including flogging, torture and murder, while the Barbados men, instead of being employed as laborers, were forced to act as armed terrorists over the surrounding population and as the instruments of the cruelty of the agents in flogging the natives. To obtain laborers raids were made upon the Indians, who were to all intents and purposes the slaves of the company and of its agents. Their women were taken by the agents as concubines or given to the Barbados people, so that concubinage and libertinage became rampant.

The flogging of Indians was of ordinary occurrence. If they did not bring in enough rubber, they were flogged; if they ran away, they were flogged and sometimes flogged to death. Of the 1,600 Indians that Mr. Casement saw, the great majority, men, women and children, bore the marks of the lash, for blood was drawn copiously, and they were cut to pieces very frequently, sometimes their wounds festering, the flesh rotting and filled with maggots, creating intolerable stench. Some of the worst marked were small boys of ten or twelve years of age. It has been said that ninety per cent. of the Indian population bear traces of this kind of punishment.

Sometimes the victim died under the lash, and at other times death ensued some days later. Occasionally salt and water would be applied to the wounds as a healing process, but in some cases, where the wounds putrefied, the victim would be shot, and in others turned adrift "with maggots in his flesh" to die in the woods. Mothers were sometimes flogged on account of the shortage of rubber by their little sons, while the poor child stood by terrified and crying. Men and women would be suspended by the arms, often twisted behind their back and tied together at the wrists, their feet hanging high above the ground, and in this position they were whipped. It has happened that Indians were tied and forcibly held under water, until they became insensible, and on one occasion a man was accidentally drowned. To ninety-nine out of every hundred Indians flogged the lash was intended not as a punishment for some wrong done, but to make the Indian bring in more rubber.

Some were suspended by a chain, fastened around the neck, with the feet barely touching the ground, and sometimes when let down they would fall a senseless mass with their tongue protruding. Men and women were deliberately starved to death, and these unfortunates have been seen scraping up the dirt with their fingers and eating it.

A common method of punishment consisted of the "cepo," or stocks, in which the body was extended on the ground, sometimes for a long period. The victim was sometimes flogged while in the stocks, and many died therein, sometimes parents, in presence of their children similarly confined and helpless to assist them. Among the charges of cruelty brought against at least one of the company's agents was that of pouring kerosene oil on men and women and burning them alive, dashing the brains out of children, cutting off the legs and arms of Indians and leaving them thus to die.

Hundreds have died in the compulsory carriage of rubber to the stations, no food being given by the company on these enforced marches, while the unfortunates were paid little or nothing for

their labor. Add to all this the murders by shooting, barbarous decapitation and unmentionable modes of torture, and you catch a faint glimpse of the horrors of the Putumayo. You begin to understand that the Pope's Encyclical, instead of exaggerating, put matters very lightly. To form an idea of the state of affairs one must read Sir Roger Casement's reports, with the testimony of his witnesses. The heart sickens at the recital of these barbarities, and we shudder to think that men of our race could sink so deeply and Christians become so degenerate.

Sir Roger Casement sent in his report in the early part of 1911, and it was unofficially communicated to the Peruvian Government as well as to the United States. The Peruvian Government was urged to punish the offenders, many of whom managed to escape. Peru instituted a judicial inquiry, the United States Government coöperated with Great Britain and matters dragged along until in April of this year the President of Peru issued a decree instituting a commission to devise a plan of reform. On June 14 Dr. Romulo Paredes, special commissioner of the Peruvian Government, after a second visit to the Putumayo district, sent in his report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is a strong corroboration of the investigation of Sir Roger Casement. Unfortunately, the worst of the criminals had fled, though some were since arrested abroad.

Sir Roger Casement's reports, with the correspondence relating to the matter, were laid before both houses of Parliament and published to the world in July of this year in a book that is for sale in London. The Pope's Encyclical had been issued in June, and in compliance with the desire of the Holy See, several English Franciscans have been designated to take up missionary work in the Putumayo.

In the midst of the many accusations and recriminations we also catch the echoes of an apologetic voice on the pages of "Peru To-day," the well-known monthly of my friend, Mr. Vavasour Noel, published in Lima. While the cruelties of the Putumayo are not denied, a certain Antonio Menacho is cited, who maintains that the Indians of those regions are cannibals. We are further told that Mr. Arana has been gathering data that may produce some startling revelations. Further, a commercial conspiracy is indicated in the following sentences:

"Many of us who see behind the scenes and know often more than we can prove in a court are convinced that while there may have been much brutality and crime in the many years that it took to conquer a savage portion of the world holding great natural wealth, the belated report of the British Consul General at Rio de Janeiro, and various circumstances of a suspicious character, from

the very beginning of the appearance of evidence and going to the very root of this question, have satisfied those who have not lost their heads that a gigantic conspiracy and blackmailing scheme is being cleverly concealed behind the mask of interference by Great Britain.

"We charge that its public men are being used by an appeal to their humanitarian instincts as pawns in a great commercial raid to gain control of that very wealthy region."

It is also charged on the authority of a correspondent of "*El Diario*" that Colombians instigated the authors of the Putumayo crimes to injure the firm of Arana, the principal shareholders in the Peruvian Amazon Company. "*Peru To-day*" for September appears with a bloodcurdling picture of a dying Indian, with the inscription:

"Tortured and allowed to starve to death by Colombians in the Putumayo regions. Blamed on Peruvians." The picture is taken from "*Variedades*," a Lima illustrated weekly. That publication ascribes the deed to seven Colombians who are now in prison in Iquitos.

The "*Inca Chronicle*," published in Peru, at Cerro de Pasco, writes: "There has been much agitation lately, both in England and in the United States, over the state of affairs revealed in the rubber district of the Putumayo River. . . . That the natives are abused, imposed upon and ill-used goes without question. But that they are as ill-treated as the perfervid imagination of an English reporter has it, is absurd, and the charge refutes itself through its gross exaggeration.

"What is happening in the Putumayo is more or less what happens every time an inferior race is exploited by a superior one. From the time the Israelites were held in bondage by the Egyptians down to the Belgian atrocities in the Congo, history abounds with such instances."

It is thus evident that there is a tendency to blame others, for Colombians are accusing Peruvians and Peruvians are blaming Colombians, while England comes in for its share. All admit the existence of abuses, which some are endeavoring to minimize and to palliate, and it is human that all should try to shift the blame. The evidence in regard to facts, whatever palliation be admitted, is overwhelming. To my mind, the responsibility may well be distributed, nor is it for me to name the guilty parties. Any impartial reader may put his hand upon them. In justice, however, be it said that all seem to be struggling to right what is wrong. Both England and the United States are continuing their investigations, and the Aranas are lending their aid toward capturing the criminals indicted for cruelties. The manager of their interests

tells the world that no crimes are committed now. The Peruvian society, "Pro Indigena," which looks after the rights of the Indians, is trying to remedy the abuses, and the Peruvian Government has been awakened to the necessity of eradicating them, although, as the writer in the "Inca Chronicle" says, the Putumayo region is more accessible to Liverpool than it is to Lima.

With all this, it is the duty of the civilized world to see to it that there be no recurrence of these abuses. A vigilant eye should be kept, not only on the Putumayo, but on the whole rubber region within the territory of or bordering on the Republics of Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and Brazil. "Peru To-day" tells us that the vast forest regions in the heart of South America are full of desperate men whose greed for gold will cause them not to hesitate at crimes of violence.

The missionaries sent out according to the wish of the Holy Father will contribute their share toward planting civilization in those immense Amazonian regions, but unless the governments of the world are willing to coöperate with them, their labors will be neutralized by the cupidity and the execrable passions of wicked men.

At the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples, held at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., from October 23 to 25, the Rev. A. E. O'Meara, of British Columbia, read a communication from the London Anti-slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, requesting the coöperation of the Mohonk Conference in regard to the Putumayo atrocities. After some hesitation and deliberation the conference passed several resolutions of sympathy, thanking Peru for the steps it has taken and urging the prosecution of reform measures, with a thorough investigation of the rubber region of South America with the coöperation of the countries concerned.

These resolutions had been suggested by Hon. G. Brady, formerly Governor of Alaska; Rev. John McDougall, of Canada; Rev. A. E. O'Meara, of British Columbia; Rev. William Hughes and Rev. Charles W. Currier, of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions; Professor F. A. McKenzie, of Columbus, Ohio, and Dr. G. H. Blakeslee, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., in a private meeting. Somewhat modified, they were unanimously adopted by the conference.

After the close of the conference the aforesaid gentlemen held another meeting, at which, in full sympathy with the resolutions adopted by the Mohonk Conference, they constituted themselves a provisional organization, with Hon. John G. Brady as president and Rev. C. W. Currier as secretary, to facilitate a permanent organization to secure international action in the interest of the

aboriginal races of the world, in coöperation with the Anti-slavery and Aborigines Protection Society.

There thus arises concerted action from the four points of the globe, and it is more than likely that the world will prevent a repetition of the Putumayo horrors wherever rubber is gathered.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

CLEMENTINA SOBIESKA.

THE story of the Stuarts in the days of their prosperity is gay and debonair withal, but scarcely edifying. It was only in exile that they learned to practice the virtues, the lack of which had so often proved their downfall. The purity of the miniature Court of James II., the holy penitent, and his wife, Mary of Modena (of whom even that shrewd critic, St. Simon, said: "She died as a saint, and as she had lived"), at St. Germain's, sustained by the royal generosity and courtesy of Louis XIV., was a standing reproach to the domestic disputes and scandals of the usurping sovereigns of England. That the still smaller Court of James' son, the third James, at the Palazzo Muti, in Rome, sustained by the bounty of the Pope, Clement XI., did not escape with the same spotless reputation is entirely due to the obstinacy and folly of James' wife, Clementina Sobieska, one of the most pathetic figures that flit across the scene of Stuart tragedy.

Next to the Baptistery at St. Peter's, over a door leading to the dome and opposite to Canova's angels guarding the monument to her husband and children, lies this unhappy princess. Don Donato, the tall sacristan of St. Peter's, smiles whimsically as the visitor pauses underneath the heavy pretentious memorial which George I. helped to erect to poor Clementina. "I do not understand," he says, smiling. "Some people—they are generally Poles—explain to me in bad Italian—oh, very bad!—that she was a martyr. Others—they are mostly English—scowl at her and tell me she made her husband miserable. A shrew, they call her. It is a little difficult."

It is difficult. The charming child who played in her nursery at being Queen of England; the high-spirited girl who enjoyed such romantic adventures at Innsbruck; the obstinate wife who sulked for over two years in a convent because her husband would not dismiss an old and valued servant; and the quiet woman who spent her last years doing good among the Roman poor and completely cutting herself off from all earthly pleasures and honors—it is a

little difficult to realize that they were one and the same person. Contemporary letters and memoirs are scanty, and however carefully and consciously the halting record is pieced together, there must remain much that cannot be explained; much that is obscure and contradictory; much that makes it difficult to pass judgment on Clementina's conduct as a wife. What is certain, is that she was the last woman James should have chosen. He to whom the world had from the moment of his birth been so cruel and so unjust; who suffered from the crime of being his father's son; whose very existence called forth a rebellion; and who, all his days, ate the bitter bread of exile, needed, if any man needed, a wife who would devote her whole heart to his comfort. He needed some one whose loving solicitude would help him to bear the repeated disappointments which rewarded his efforts to regain the throne which was his birthright; whose sympathy would give him courage to bear with the taunts and calumnies of his enemies; whose constancy would compensate him for the treachery of his so-called friends.

That was just what Clementina, with all her good points, was most unfitted for. There was some affection, but never much sympathy between them. Clementina, with her uncertain temper and her habit of meddling and her obstinate will, was a hindrance rather than a help, and an additional anxiety rather than a source of consolation. James never quite knew where her well-meaning efforts to further his cause were going to lead her and him; and she never could understand why he did not appreciate her interest in politics. The world called her a shrewd politician; her husband treated her as a spoiled child; it was certainly a little hard for them both.

It was only after several other princesses had been inspected and refused—one because of "a certain redness of the nose," another because she was "nothing better than a dwarf," and a third because she was too old—that Clementina Sobieska, granddaughter of the heroic King John of Poland (whose exploits against the Turks had made him the idol of Europe) and niece of the Emperor Charles VI. of Austria, was chosen—probably on account of her enormous dowry—to share James Stuart's fortunes. Prince James Sobieski, Clementina's father, was eager for the match, and the little bride herself, whose earliest ambition seems to have been to be Queen of England—one wonders why she set her heart on England in particular; there seems to be no clue to the choice—was by no means unwilling. The following charming letter to her royal lover has been preserved among Clementina's correspondence:

"I may, *sans sortir de la modestie*, declare to you, Sire, that paternal authority had not much trouble to make itself obeyed not to make my fate depend on that of your Majesty."

The news of the proposed marriage was received with dismay by the Hanoverian party in England. It was feared that many who had not bestirred themselves for James single would become ardent partisans of James married and likely to have an heir to his hopes. The birth of a child would certainly cause an outburst of Jacobite enthusiasm; therefore, the marriage must, at all costs, be prevented. King George I. accordingly used pressure to make the Emperor forbid his niece to marry James Stuart. Much against his will, the sorely tried uncle feebly protested with Prince James Sobieska, and later, by George's commands, detained the Princess and her mother at Innsbruck as they were on their way to Italy.

The story of Clementina's romantic escape has been told a thousand times. Four gallant Irish officers in James' service—Wogan, O'Toole, Gaydon and Misset—rode to the rescue and managed to introduce Jenny, Mrs. Misset's maid, into Clementina's apartment. The young lady, so they told the maid, wanted to elope with Captain O'Toole, Gaydon and Misset—rode to the rescue and managed to help them. With encouraging words, the little maid changed clothes with the Princess, bidding her have confidence in "Captain O'Toole's merit and worth." Clementina entered into the spirit of the thing and played her part so well that she escaped without difficulty in Jenny's clothes and entered the carriage that was waiting for her, unseen and unsuspected.

Attended by Mrs. Misset and guarded by her Irish knights, she traveled night and day to gain the frontier. For three days she never fell asleep nor ceased asking Mrs. Misset excited questions about the manners and customs of the English court, showing plainly that she had high hopes of one day being *de facto* Queen of England. At length she slept, only to awaken when she was safely across the frontier. On hearing that she was in Italy at last, she alighted from the carriage, and with the piety which distinguished her through life, went into the nearest church to say a Te Deum for her escape.

On May 7, 1719, she was married, Lord Murray acting as James' proxy. Before the marriage began it was explained to her that her husband was detained in Spain, and might not be able to join her for some months, and that, therefore, for the sake of prudence, she must agree that, should the Emperor seize her again before she and James had come together, the marriage was null and void. This discouraging and unusual provision was made in James' interest. It would have been disastrous if he were bereft of his bride and left in the position of being unable to marry again during the lifetime of his seventeen-year-old wife. We are not told what Clementina thought of this arrangement. Probably to her sanguine

temperament the chances of capture, after her recent successful and exhilarating escape, seemed too remote to dwell upon. Probably, too, she was intelligent enough to understand that prudence, and not any desire to get rid of her, had induced James to make such a condition. In any case, she seems to have made no objection, and the marriage proceeded.

Meanwhile James' hopes were high. Spain, already at war with Austria, was preparing to invade England in the Jacobite interest. Four months later, however, the bridegroom returned to Italy after one more disappointment. He met Clementina at Montefiascone, and there a second marriage took place, the Pope having declared the first marriage (the "*matrimonio de futuro*," as Cardinal Gualterio called it) to be invalid. James was charmed with his bride, and wrote to Lord Mar saying she possessed all the virtues and no self-will. He brought her to Rome, where the Holy Father treated them both with magnificent generosity, giving them the Palazzo Muti, in the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, as their residence and a villa at Albano for their summer quarters.

Seventeen months later, to the rage and despair of the Hanoverian party and the delirious delight of the Jacobites, Clementina gave birth to a son. At this time she was the idol of Rome. Her toilettes, her beauty and her charm of manner won many hearts that poor James, with his stiff, cold ways and slow intelligence, had failed to capture. Had Clementina only kept a still tongue in her head, she might have done her husband's cause a great deal of good; as it was, swayed by flattery, misled by traitors and taught to fancy herself a keen politician, she ended by doing a great deal of harm. Among her most gracious acts was the kindness she showed in offering to be godmother to the infant daughter of a certain Captain Walkinshaw, who had helped her husband's cause. Little did she dream, when she held the child in her arms and desired that she should be called Clementina, that the destinies of the infant prince and the baby Clementina would be linked in such a painful manner. Had not Bonnie Prince Charlie loved and sinned with Clementina Walkinshaw for so many years, he might never have ruined his own cause and have sunk so low as to drown his hopes in the wine cup.

Time went on, and Clementina began to realize that in all probability she would never be anything more than a queen "*in partibus*." Restless and ambitious and inclined to chafe at her husband's slowness, she was ready to exclaim with the fiery Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, "This is the best cause in Europe, lost for want of spirit!"

Clementina had plenty of spirit if James had not, and she set herself to work, never doubting that she, with her quicker brain,

could gain the throne for James without his help. Unfortunately, she was not quite so intelligent as she thought, and there were too many so-called friends at hand ready to flatter and mislead her, pretending to be her tools, but in reality making a tool of her. James watched his wife's tactics, first with uneasiness and then with despair. It was useless to remonstrate with her; she absolutely refused to listen to him; openly refused to obey him, and told him plainly that she was the better politician of the two, and that he might safely leave his cause in her hands. So they drifted rapidly apart, not even the birth of a second son, the future Cardinal, doing much to heal the breach.

There were in James' household two factions: the one loyal and devoted, led by John Hay, Lord Inverness; the other outwardly zealous, but secretly treacherous,, led by Lord Mar. Mar was a villain of such consummate ability that though he was receiving a pension of £2,000 from King George I. at the very time he was James' Secretary of State, not one of his colleagues ever suspected him of being anything but James' most devoted servant. James himself gave him his entire confidence, and, acting on his advice, dismissed from his service the faithful Murray, one of the best servants in the world. There still remained John Hay, and Mar was only too willing to encourage Clementina's unreasonable dislike for the man to induce James to get rid of him, as he had got rid of Murray. The reason for Clementina's dislike is not clear, but it is possible that, being a foreigner and regarding her husband's cause as the cause of heaven and the Catholic religion against a rebellious Protestant people, she found it difficult to understand that Hay, and hundreds of Protestants like him, were willing to shed the last drop of their blood for him whom they considered their rightful sovereign. Any such suspicion, however, fails to excuse Clementina for the way she treated James. When he refused to listen to her advice and dismiss Inverness, she flew into a passion and, without warning, retired to a convent, declaring her intention of staying there until Hay had left Rome and James' service. While at the convent she wrote a number of letters, giving various reasons to justify her action. She informed the Pope that she had been forced to act as she did because James had insisted on choosing a Protestant governor for Prince Charles. At the same time she wrote to other friends, to whom the religious question would not appeal, stating that James' infatuation for Inverness was the cause of her retirement.

Malicious tongues, encouraged by the crafty Mar, industriously spread abroad the lying report that an unlawful attachment for Hay's wife was the cause of the dispute between husband and wife.

The Pope put a plain question to Clementina on this point, to which she would only reply, parrot fashion, "*Je n'aime pas ces gens là!*" It is impossible to believe that she was jealous of any woman. James' very enemies admitted—with regret—that his private life was above suspicion, and no one could have known it better than his wife. It therefore seems inexplicable that Clementina, an intelligent woman, did not realize that had she, like Mar, been in receipt of a pension from the Hanoverian court, she could not have served that court better than by acting as she did. Yet she refused for two years to listen to reason. The Pope (Benedict XIII., who had succeeded Clement XI.) was at first impressed by what Clementina told him, and called upon James to explain what excuse he had for choosing a Protestant governor for his son. James replied that political reasons had induced him to take this step. The Prince would, he hoped, one day be King of England, and, that country being unfortunately Protestant, he judged it wise to bring up the boy under Protestant eyes, to disarm prejudice. The child's studies were in the hands of a Catholic tutor, and the Pope satisfied himself by examining the Prince that he was well instructed in the catechism. Thereupon the Holy Father informed Clementina that her fears were groundless, and advised her to return to her husband. James also wrote a very dignified and affectionate letter, remonstrating with her for her cruel, childish and unjust conduct:

"*Votre conduite envers moi, les menaces qui m'ont été faites, et l'outrage public de votre retraite dans un couvent, ne me touchent pas autant que le malheur et la honte auxquelles vous allez vous exposer par si étrange démarche. Je sens le tout, il est vrai, comme je dois; mais jusqu'à présent je n'ai aucun ressentiment contre vous, car je suis à chaque moment convaincu que la malice et la finesse de nos ennemis en ont imposée à votre jeunesse et à la faiblesse de votre sexe. Vous avez dû être persuadée, il y a longtemps, que je veux être le maître dans nos affaires et dans ma famille; mais il n'est encore trop tard de se reconnaître. Rendez-vous à la raison, au devoir, et à moi, qui attend que vos submissions à bras ouverts, pour vous rendre la paix et le bonheur autant que dépend de moi. Que, si, malgré, les derniers efforts de ma tendresse vous persistez dans la résolution dont vous m'avez menacée, il ne seroit toujours une consolation de songer que je n'ai rien négligée pour vous empêcher. Je vous conjure encore une fois, ma chère Clementine, d'y penser sérieusement.*

"Signé: JACQUES R."

Much has been said of James' very mediocre brains. It is said that he differed from his half-brother, the Duke of Berwick, inso-much as while the Duke's countenance was "sad and severe," James'

was "sad and silly." Probably, though not brilliant, he was not quite so silly as his enemies liked to believe. At any rate, the letter just quoted shows a sober judgment and a dignity which do him credit. Perhaps, however, with all its generosity, it was not the most tactful method of treating a young woman who prided herself on her intelligence and knowledge of the world to tell her that the "cunning of the enemy had imposed on her youthfulness and the weakness of her sex."

One wonders why James did not appeal to her maternal feelings and remind her of the two small children she had deserted. At no time does she seem to have been a very devoted mother, however, for even after what we call her conversion she preferred to work among the poor, giving her whole time and thoughts to her charitable undertakings, than to make up for the time when she had left them by living in the happiness of her little boys. We are told that they never went out except when their father took them, because their mother had neither time nor liking for amusements and gayety. Obstinate as she remained to the end, no one could persuade her that noble as was the work she was doing, her real work lay at home with the husband and children she had always neglected.

Meanwhile, while still in her convent, she began to ruin her health by severe and constant mortifications. In fact, there is no doubt that at this time her habits, acting on a feeble constitution, were the exciting cause of the lung trouble from which she died four years after her reconciliation with her husband. Poor woman, no one could induce her to believe that a humble submission to her very patient spouse would be worth all the hours of prayer in the convent chapel which so edified the good nuns! It was only after two years that peace was made. It is said that the Pope told Clementina that she would be deprived of the sacraments if she did not bend her stubborn will and return to her home. However this may be, suddenly, and apparently of her own free will, she wrote to James (then at Avignon) that she desired above all things to please him, and was on the point of joining her children at Avignon or Bologna. The letter very characteristically contained no excuses, and was signed by his "very humble, very obedient and ever faithful wife!" At the same time her humility, her obedience and her faithfulness did not prevent her from refusing James' first request—that she should join him at Avignon, where he was forced by political reasons to remain for the time being; nor did it prevent her from going against his express commands by bringing with her, as governess to her children, Mrs. Shelton, former governess to the little Princes and spy in the pay of Lord Mar.

At the news of this woman's arrival at Bologna with his wife, James' patience—it really had been wonderful—gave out. Writing to Cardinal Gualterio, he says that he feels that he can scarcely refrain from taking "some violent step to release myself from a wife who, by her return to my family, has shown, if possible, a stronger spirit of rebellion than by her flight into a convent, and who knows, by the finest dissimulation and hypocrisy, how to cover her true dispositions to the public." Certainly, reading Clementina's letters at this period, one is forced to conclude that she was either a pious fraud or else that she was absolutely without a sense of humor. The difference between her dutiful, wifely protestations and her wilfully disobedient conduct is great to admit of any other explanation. Fortunately, however, James was not driven to take the "violent step" he contemplated. At the last moment, hearing that her husband was about to leave Avignon for Bologna, Clementina had the grace to dismiss Mrs. Shelton. James, delighted at her submission, received his wife with every token of affection and forgiveness, making no allusion to the past and sparing her all those reproaches which a less patient husband would not have failed to make. Neither Mrs. Shelton nor Lord Inverness was mentioned, and James, disarmed by Clementina's silence, flattered himself that his domestic troubles were over for good and all.

Hay was at this time, by his own unselfish wish, in retirement, lest the sight of him should cause Clementina to repent of her good resolutions. Such fears were by no means groundless, but James, deceived by her submissive behavior, wrote to Inverness in a hopeful strain, saying that he had no doubt that his wife would be quite willing to agree to any step which he (James) saw fit to take. "She leads," he added, "a most retired, melancholy life, and though I have encouraged her to alter it, I don't believe she will, but that's her affair, and I shall not constrain her."

Clementina was, in fact, Clementina still! She possessed many virtues, no doubt, but she did not know the meaning of humility and submission. Secure in the consciousness of her own good intentions and never doubting her own judgment, she refused to obey even the commands of her confessor, Blessed Leonard of Port Maurice, when he told her that the life of mortification she was leading was ruining her health and not pleasing to God, and that increased charity towards her husband and children was her first and most important duty. Charitable, in a sense, she had always been, and no one was more beloved among the Roman poor. She not only gave large sums out of her private purse to the various benevolent institutions she took an interest in, but she spent the greater part of her time, after her return to James, among the

outcast and the wretched. Those whom she benefited extolled her as a saint, and not a few hinted that she was a martyr to a tyrannical husband!

Meanwhile, during the first few weeks of the reconciliation, there was peace between them. It was only when James, deceived by her silence, began to speak of recalling Inverness that the storm broke. To his astonishment, Clementina declared passionately that she had only returned on condition that Inverness was to be banished forever, and went on to say that in the event of his return she would retire again to her convent without more ado. James, at his wits' end, replied that she could please herself, whereupon she burst into tears and declared she was *enciente*. This piece of news, of course, altered the case, and James, feeling that his hands were tied, gave way, promising that Inverness should remain in retirement, lest his presence should injure Clementina's health and endanger his hopes.

There is no doubt that at this time Clementina's mind was unbalanced, for she fell a prey to the fixed idea that Inverness—about whose virtue and honor there can be no possible shadow of doubt—was plotting to poison her. James behaved with his usual patience, humoring his poor wife and granting her lightest whim, until it was discovered that her hopes had been unfounded. If he suspected that she had deliberately deceived him, James was too generous to accuse her, though his enemies, with less scruple, did not hesitate to spread abroad the utterly false statement that a chance meeting with Lady Inverness had awakened Clementina's jealousy and caused a miscarriage. From that time Clementina's health began to wane so rapidly that James made up his mind to devote himself entirely to her, letting her have her own way in every detail and consenting that Inverness should remain in retirement. Probably this faithful and sorely tried servant would never have seen his beloved master again had not the death of Pope Benedict XIV. and the accession of Cardinal Ciorisini, under the title of Clement XII., made a fresh move in the affair.

The new Pope's sympathies were entirely with James in his domestic difficulties, and he lost no time in telling Clementina that her conduct was highly disedifying and altogether inexcusable. Clementina held out with her usual obstinacy, but at length, after two months, informed James, without comment, that she was willing that Inverness should return. James received her submission with delight and tenderness, and after a long conversation between husband and wife, a true and lasting reconciliation was made between them. Inverness and his wife returned, and Clementina, at

last convinced of her injustice and folly, treated them both with royal kindness and condescension, showering honors on them both in public as well as in private and omitting nothing which could repair the wrong she had done. Soon after Inverness' return James went to Naples for his health, and the letters which he and Clementina exchanged during their separation show how completely they were now united.

"I can think of nothing but the satisfaction I shall feel when I shall see Caro Mio again," she writes.

James ends his reply with, "Cara mia, je suis tout á vous!"

Their happiness was not to last long. Four years after her return Clementina died, at the age of thirty-three. She was sincerely mourned by her husband and by persons of all classes, but especially by the poor, whom she had always loved. It is not surprising that they called her a saint and invoked her intercession after death. The following letter, now among the Stuart papers, is written in Latin and dated June 30, 1781:

"I, Ferdinand Sturm, noble of Hirschfeld, and a Doctor in Medicine, once in the year commended myself to the Venerable Maria Clementina, Queen of Great Britain, and in the merits of her name, I petitioned God Almighty to restore my son's health. I prayed from the inmost depth of my heart, making vows that I promised to fulfill till my life's end in honor of this Advocate. Then I returned to the sick room, where I found my son lying in his mother's arms and suffering from an attack of bleeding from the nostrils, whereby he was relieved of more than two pounds of blood within the space of an hour and a half. Joyfully, the child cried out to me: 'Dear father, I am well again at last!' Then, voluntarily arising from his bed, he was from that moment restored to his original health. And many other boons have I since obtained by means of this powerful patroness."*

This is only one of a good many miracles believed to have been wrought through the intercession of Clementina, and at one time it was thought that a formal application would be made to obtain her beatification. No such plea has ever been advanced, however, and although no wise person would presume to anticipate the decisions of the Church, it does not seem likely that any such cause will ever be seriously considered.

The magnificence of Clementina's funeral was long afterwards remembered and talked of in Rome. The body, embalmed and clothed in the habit of a Dominican nun—for Clementina was a Tertiary of St. Dominic—was borne by Dominicans to the Basilica of the Santi Apostoli. There it remained for three days and nights,

* Herbert Vaughan, "The Last of the Royal Stuarts," p. 9.

laid on a splendid catafalque in the choir, near the bodies of the Holy Apostles Philip and James. The church was draped in black, edged with silver, and lit by the light of thousands of wax tapers. Night and day the Papal Guards stood by the corpse with drawn swords, while a continual stream of visitors came to gaze their last at Clementina's quiet face and to pray for the repose of her soul. On the third day her ladies-in-waiting reverently removed the Dominican habit and clothed their mistress in royal robes of purple velvet and ermine. A crown was placed on the head that had never worn it in life, and a sceptre placed in the pale hand. Thus in death Clementina received the honors she had craved and always been denied.

Thirty-three Cardinals assisted at the solemn office of the dead, which proceeded the funeral procession to St. Peter's. In that procession walked the students of the English, Irish and Scotch Colleges in Rome, all the religious confraternities in their picturesque habits, a detachment of cuirassiers and a vast number of people of all classes who had loved Clementina. St. Peter's was draped in black, adorned with the royal arms of England, Scotland, Ireland and Poland, and the splendor of the Requiem Mass equaled that which was sung for another princess of romantic history—Christina of Sweden. During the *De Profundis* the royal robes were taken from the body, which was clothed once more in the Dominican habit. When all was over the coffin was lowered in the crypt. Later her heart was removed, enclosed in an urn and placed in the Basilica of the Santi Apostoli. Before it James was wont to spend many hours a day in tears and sorrow. This act was considered by some people to be a proof of repentance for the wrong he had done his wife. It is difficult, however, to label his conduct as a husband as anything but affectionate, faithful and most long-suffering. There may, of course, be facts which have not come down to us—one is tempted now and then to think that there surely must be—which would account for Clementina's strange behavior. It is certain, however, that, whatever she may have suffered, she never accused James of anything worse than of having chosen a Protestant governor for his son and of having refused to dismiss Inverness from his service. Nor does it seem likely that a woman who stood up for her rights as loudly and obstinately as Clementina had done would have hesitated to speak, and speak publicly, had she had other grievances to air. James, like every one else, had faults, and it is possible that had he been less tenacious of his marital authority and had he condescended to pretend to consult Clementina's opinion, even if he did not see his way to take her advice, much friction between them would have been avoided. But he

always treated her like a spoiled child, and nothing could have been more galling to her pride.

One cannot help thinking—perhaps it is an idle fancy—that Clementina had been ill advised and had mistaken her vocation. With her intelligence, her generous instincts and strong principles, and above all, with her very sincere piety, she might, with proper training, have made an excellent nun. One can imagine she would have made a very conscientious and capable reverend mother superior.

E. COWELL.

Bishop's Stortford, England.

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SINAI AND THEIR RELATION TO CERTAIN FACTS OF SCRIPTURE.

DOUBTLESS many have seen, if not in the originals themselves, at least in illustrated books and journals, examples of those strange Egyptian characters such as were sculptured or written on the obelisks and mummy-chests and other monuments of that mysterious land. From the days antecedent to Christianity those characters were before the learned world, but yet they were as mysterious in the meaning they were intended to convey as the Sphynx itself, that other Egyptian puzzle to the learned of all ages. Writings they were known to be, but yet the key to this mysterious writing no one was in possession of till, just a century ago, it turned up, as if by chance, in the most natural manner possible.

It was in this way: In 1799, whilst Lieutenant Bouchard, an artillery officer in the French army of occupation, was building the fort of San Julien at Rosetta, a town on the Delta, he came across a monolith in black granite, ten feet high by three and a half feet wide, on which was inscribed writing in three columns—one column of the inscription was in the unknown Egyptian characters, since called hieroglyphics; the second, in cursive characters, evidently a simplification of the preceding, and the third, in the Greek characters and language.

Here was a find which might put the world at last in possession of the locked-up literary treasures of this land of mystery. The Greek could, of course, be easily deciphered, and the inscription turned out to be a decree of the priests in honor of Ptolemy Epiphanes, commanding that his statue be erected in all the temples of the kingdom and that divine honors be rendered to him on his



birthday. The learned knew that the writings on the other columns were to the same purpose; but how to decipher them was the question.

Though the Rosetta stone was, through the chances of war, put in the possession of the English, and is to be seen to-day in the Egyptian hall of the British Museum in London, yet it is to a Frenchman that we are indebted for the triumph of unlocking, mainly through it, the treasures of the Egyptian world of letters.

Champollion, a talented young Frenchman, determined to try and solve the problem of the mysterious language of the monuments by a serious study of the Coptic or ancient Egyptian language. This language remained the vernacular of the Copts; that is, the remains of the ancient Egyptian people, down to the middle of the seventeenth century, and is still the liturgical language of the Monophisites, one of the Christian sects which has lingered in the East from the early days of Christianity.

Noting that certain of the characters in the first two columns were enclosed in a cartouch or parallelogram, he conjectured that they would represent the name of the king himself. True enough, they responded in number to the letters of the name Ptolemy. A second bilingual monument in Egyptian and Greek was discovered about the same time in the Isle of Phila, on the first cataract of the Nile, on which was inscribed in cartouch the name of Cleopatra. The same test applied produced the same result. Afterwards, a third cartouch, with the name of Alexander, was in the same way identified. Here, then, were the characters of three full names deciphered, making in all twenty-seven characters, fourteen of which were different ones.

Want of space does not permit a further inquiry into the process of identification. Suffice it to say that this plucky Frenchman, in the course of his short life of forty-two years, was not only able to decipher 260 different phonetic characters (the whole number of hieroglyphics deciphered up to the present, including variants, phonetic complements and determinatives, is between 3,000 to 4,000); but from his deathbed he dictated an Egyptian grammar which has been the basis of all the Egyptian learning acquired in later years.

An early difficulty that Champollion had to meet with and master was that of monophones and polyphones; that is, the deciphering of different characters representing the same alphabetical sound and of the same characters representing altogether different syllabic sounds, together with their determinatives; also the distinction between alphabetic characters, syllabic characters and ideographs, or characters representing complete ideas. This same difficulty in a

far more complicated form had to be met with and solved in an altogether different family of languages, the cuneiform—and solved it was, in such a manner as to confer everlasting credit on human perseverance.

To conclude about the hieroglyphics, for that is the name given to those strange Egyptian characters, they are imitations of material objects, images of every kind, borrowed from all the kingdoms of nature, and even from the imagination; besides the hieroglyphics, properly speaking, which are the characters employed in public monuments, there are two other species of Egyptian characters, derived from the former, it is true, but yet distinct from them, namely, the *hieratic* and the *demotic*.

The hieratic, or sacred characters, are abbreviations and simplifications of the hieroglyphic, and were employed in transactions where a more cursive hand was desired, and the demotic, or popular writing, which is of a later date, may be said to be the writing of the civil and business life of the Egyptian people.

So much for the deciphering of the hieroglyphics. It might be an appropriate subject for an article, the pointing out the knowledge of antiquity which their deciphering has put us in possession of, and more particularly the showing forth the use that that knowledge has been put to under the providence of God in strengthening the relation of certain important facts of Scripture and in testifying to the authenticity of Scripture itself.

Egypt has been called the land of mystery, and a land of mystery it had been deemed from the most ancient times; and this veil of mystery has hung round it, its institutions and people, almost down to our own day.

It is to the credit of the great Napoleon that when he conducted his expedition into Egypt in 1798-9 his army was accompanied by a whole host of scientific men who went to study the monuments of this ancient land of the Pharaohs. This led to the first methodical investigation of its antiquities, an investigation which continues with unabated interest down to the present day. What, as a result, with the key of its literary treasures in hand and with the wonderful discoveries—one would rather say with the resurrection of its ancient monuments from the slumber of the grave where they lay for thousands of years, we come to know a great deal indeed, comparatively, concerning the life and activities of its people, and this from the most primitive times. What is more, that knowledge has been given us under the providence of God as a great weapon to combat and overcome the enemies of religion.

For an instance of this, this article will deal principally not with Egypt proper, but with the Peninsula of Sinai, a dependency of

Egypt from the most ancient times, even as now. It was impiously asserted by Voltaire that the books of the Law, otherwise called the Pentateuch, could not have been written in the time of Moses, because of the barbarism of the times, and because, as he asserted, the custom of writing on papyrus was unknown at that early epoch. And later critics of the same sacred books, founding their judgment in part on the same unsound premises, came to the conclusion that they were written not earlier than the seventh to the ninth century before Christ.

What are the facts? We have writing in hieroglyphics going back thousands of years before Moses' time, writings not revealing the crude efforts of a barbarous people, but in the last stage of perfection, and giving details of the most elaborate polity and working of a highly organized and powerful monarchy. What is more, there are still extant many documents in papyrus that are contemporary with Moses, and some even that were written hundreds of years before his time.

It had been known for many years that the turquoise ornaments which were worn by the wealthy Egyptians in ancient times and which in such lavish abundance decorated their mummies after death were quarried from the rocks of Sinai. Moreover, it was known that the precious ornaments could be procured only by expeditions, the cost of which could be undertaken only by royal authority. For Sinai is an inhospitable land, consisting almost entirely of barren rocks, interspersed here and there with wadies, or canyons, where only a little corn and some vegetables could be raised by the few Arabs who inhabited it.

It was customary then for the Egyptian monarchs to send, from time to time, expeditions into the peninsula to quarry the precious turquoises and to smelt copper from the rich ores that lay embedded in the mountains, and this could be done only at certain seasons, on account of the intense heat of the place. These expeditions had to be supported through means of relays of camels and asses, which carried provisions and water from the shore and from the distant wells. All this was done with the order and precision which only Egypt was capable of.

These expeditions were usually accompanied by artists and scribes who chiseled on the mountainside sculptures and inscriptions to the glory of the Pharo who sent them, and often giving precious details concerning the expedition itself.

For the commendable purpose of research and survey the British School of Archæology in Egypt in 1905, with the aid of disbursements from what is known as the Egyptian Exploration Fund, commissioned a number of scientists, at the head of whom was

Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie, to study, to take paper squeezes of and to catalogue more accurately those precious monuments of antiquity.

It was not a day too soon. For when the expedition arrived at Wady Maghareh, the chief centre of interest, they found that the workmen of English mining companies had, **three years previously**, blasted away most of the inscriptions previously known, in search of turquoise; blasted away the rocks on which were chiseled those sculptures and inscriptions, many of which had come down untouched by the barbarians during the space of from six to seven thousand years. This work of devastation was afterwards continued by the natives, with the result that many of the most important still remaining were destroyed. Blasting, as the chief of the expedition complained, was continually going on at those mines, and the nearness of sculptures made no difference to the operatives.

When the expedition arrived a large block with an inscription of Sahura of the fifth dynasty (who reigned 4426-4413 B. C.) was being broken up, and they were just in time to save the inscription, which is now in the Museum of Brussels. And while they were in course of copying the numerous inscriptions of the twelfth dynasty a native workman came and effaced them with a hammer during the dinner hour. Of those barbarous proceedings Mr. Petrie bitterly complains, and says that the Goths were cultured in comparison to those dividend-hunting Englishmen, for while the Goths—barbarians as they were—preserved the writings and monuments of ancient Rome, those modern commercial companies ruthlessly destroyed monuments in comparison to which those of ancient Rome were but as yesterday.

To find a parallel to the destruction wrought by those speculating companies one must look to the Turkish destruction of the Acropolis of Athens, or Mahomet Ali's wrecking of temples to build factories and magazines.

As previously mentioned, the expeditions sent periodically by the Egyptian Pharoos to Sinai were accompanied by artists who chiseled, high on the sandstone rock, sculptures and inscriptions to the glory of their masters. Those sculptures and inscriptions were executed principally in the vicinity of the two great mining camps at Wady Maghareh and Serabit-el Cadem, and they have reference to monarchs of several of the dynasties from the twelfth back to the first dynasty.

The most ancient of those sculptures represents Semerkhet, seventh king of the first dynasty, who is said to have reigned 5291-5273 B. C., and his general. His figure is drawn in three attitudes, in one of which he is represented as striking to earth a Beduay chief,

to commemorate his victory of the Semites of his time. On a smooth, natural face of the sandstone rock, at 394 feet above the valley floor, the scene of this king has been engraved by sinking the ground and leaving the figures in relief. It is a piece conceived with great power and truth. And it tells well for the preservative qualities of the climate of this ancient land that the sculpture is to-day, after 7,200 years, as it is claimed, as clear-cut and perfect as if it were only yesterday that it left the sculptor's hands.

Another thing to note, and which is just as well mentioned here (and it is a thing that will cause thought), is the remarkable fact that the sculptures and other artistic monuments of this age, say from 4000 to 5000 B. C., show a much higher artistic attainment than do those of the later periods of Egyptian history, and that, moreover, hieroglyphy had already arrived at the last stage of development.

The next monument left standing was that of Sa-Nekht, the founder of the third dynasty, who reigned 4945-4919 B. C. This is the first inscription directly connected with the mining industry, as it was placed over an early mine. The head and face of this king is strongly Ethiopian in character. It is a type familiar among the Sudanys of the Egyptian army, and goes with a dark brown skin and very truculent character.

Other sculptures are those of Sneferu, the last king of the third dynasty (B. C. 4750). With those sculptures are to be found plenty of hieroglyphics. Like Semerkhet, of the first dynasty, Sneferu is represented in one of those scenes smiting a Beduay; his name is in relief before him and incised behind him with the inscription: "Sneferu, the Great God, giving power, firmness and life, all health and all satisfaction of heart forever, smiting the countries."

The next is Sahura of the fifth dynasty (who reigned 4426-4413 B. C.).

An interesting one is that of Cheops of the sixth dynasty, the builder of the great pyramid.*

It should be mentioned before going further that the expedition, seeing the wanton destruction of monuments that was going on all around, determined to detach several of the most precious, which they did, and with the exception of the scene of Semerkhet, which they were unable to detach, being high out of reach, they may be seen to-day in the Museum of Cairo.

* The great pyramid of Cheops, at Gizeh, stands on a basis 764 feet square, and thus covers nearly thirteen acres. It is 450 feet high, and was, when perfect, covered with white marble. It contains 82,111,000 cubic feet of masonry, and, according to Herodotus, it took the labor of 100,000 men for twenty years to build it. It was Napoleon who calculated that its mass of material would build a wall eight feet high and eighteen inches thick from Paris to Moscow.

Close by the other great mining camp of Serabit-el Cadem the sculptures and inscriptions are still more numerous, and there is here besides the ancient temple of "Hat-Hor," "mistress of the turquoise," presumably the Phœnician "Istar," "Asteroth," revealing a Semitic ritual and worship many centuries earlier than the Exodus.

Space forbids to go further than make mention of them and to note that the oldest trace of occupation here is of Sneferu, the last king of the third dynasty (about 4750 B. C.).

To some, however, the antiquity claimed for those monuments may seem incredible, and the questions may be asked:

First: Have we data to sustain the alleged antiquity of those monuments?

Second: What of the teaching received in our early days that the human race was created some 4000 years B. C.?

Proofs exist to sustain the antiquity of the Sinaitic monuments; incontrovertible ones, as may be seen from an outline of the system on which Egyptian chronology is based, and in a general way from these proofs themselves, though space forbids entering as fully as desirable into more detail concerning them. Those who may wish to study the question more fully should refer to Flinders Petrie's work on "Researches in Sinai," the chapter on the "Revision of Egyptian Chronology."

The whole checking of Egyptian chronology rests on the unquestionable fact that the Egyptians ignored the leap year and counted only 365 days to the year. There have been defects in every calendar, simply because the motions of the earth have no exact relation to each other or to those of the moon.

The Mohammedan calendar, for instance, falls short eleven days each year, by taking twelve lunar months as the year, which only amounts to 354½ days. Thus the whole of the Arab months shift round the seasons in about thirty years.

The Egyptian slipped his months backward a quarter of a day each year by not keeping up the enumeration, as now done, with a 29th of February every fourth year. As the months thus slipped backward or the seasons appeared to slip forward in the calendar, in 1460 years the months shifted round all the seasons. (Strictly, the year does not contain exactly an odd quarter of a day, but 242, so that the rotation of the months would take place in 1,500 years. But as the earth's rotation is slackening, the fraction was exactly a quarter of a day in historic times (say 3231 B. C.), and it may be called so, as the Egyptians did.

In order to observe the seasons exactly, the mere changes of heat or of growth are too vague, and the Egyptians saw that some connection between the sun and the stars should be noted. As they

had no exact timekeeper, they could not compare the sun by day and the stars by night, so they adopted the first appearance of a star in the glow of sunrise. For their star of observation they took "Sirius," the brightest of all the stars, otherwise called "Sothus," "Canicula" or "the dog star." According to Censorinus, who wrote A. D. 239, "The beginning of those years is always reckoned from the first day of that month, which is called by the Egyptians Thoth, which happened A. D. 139 on the 12th of the kalends of August: i. e., 21st July, on which day Sirius (Canicula) regularly rises in Egypt."

Thus the new year's day of the months—the 1st of Thoth—coincided in 139 A. D. with the fixed astronomical feature of the rising of Sirius, in the dawn just before the sun, which was on July 21. (This, of course, differed by a day or two, by reason of difference of latitude, in different parts of Egypt.) The same would happen on each recurring cycle of $365 \times 4 = 1,460$ years backward. Hence it follows that the 1st of Thoth, the Egyptian New Year's Day, occurred on the 21st of July in the year 139 A. D. above mentioned and in the years 1322, 2782, 4242, 5702 B. C. In the intermediate years it occurred a day earlier in the calendar every fourth year, shifting backwards through the seasons.

In going backward the first great datum that is met is that on the back of the "Medical Ebers papyrus," where it is stated that Sirius rose on the 9th of Epiphi (the eleventh Egyptian month), in the 9th year of Amenhotep I. As the 9th of Epiphi is 56 days before the 1st of Thoth, Sirius rose on that day at 4×56 years = 224 years before the dates given above; i. e., 1322, etc., B. C. As only 1322 B. C. can be the epoch here, it results that $1322 + 224$ equals 1546 B. C. for the 9th year of Amenhotep I., 1554 B. C. for his accession. And as Aahmes I., his predecessor, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty, reigned twenty-five years, 1579 B. C. is reached for the accession of Aahmes I. and the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty. This is not defined within a few years, first, owing to four years being the equivalent of only one day's shift; second, owing to the rising being perhaps observed in a different part of Egypt at different times; third, owing to various minor astronomical details. But this gives 1580 B. C. as the approximate date for the great epoch of the rise of the eighteenth dynasty.

At the next step is found the parting of the ways of the two great schools of Egyptian chronology, and it arises from the point as to whether there should be allowed an interval of 206 years for the reign of the kings of five dynasties—the thirteenth to the seventeenth—or rather 206 years plus a whole cycle of 1,460 years, that is, 1,666 years. But this must be explained.

Antecedent to the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, that is, 1580 B. C., a papyrus document (that from Kehun, now in Berlin) makes mention of another Sirius rising on the 17th of Pharmuthi (the eighth Egyptian month). This was in the seventh year of Senusert III., of the twelfth dynasty. This shows that the 17th of Pharmuthi then fell on the 21st of July, which gives the seventh year of Senusert III. at the one or the other of two possible dates, viz., either at 1874 B. C. or a cycle of 1,460 years earlier, that is, in the year 3,334 B. C. As he reigned probably 38 years, that is to say, 31 years after the above date, he died either in the year 1843 B. C. or 3303 B. C. Amenemhat III., his successor, reigned 44 years, as his monuments show. Amenemhat IV., the next king, nine years, and Sebekneferu, next and last king of the twelfth dynasty, four years, according to the Turin papyrus. These reigns bring the close of the twelfth dynasty either to the year 1786 B. C., or a cycle of 1,460 years earlier, viz., 3246 B. C.

It is necessary, then, to decide by the internal evidence of the monuments of the kings which of these dates is probable, by seeing whether the interval of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties was $1,786 - 1,580 = 206$ years, or else $3,246 - 1,580 = 1,666$ years.

This question has been merely ignored hitherto, and it has been assumed by all the German school that the later date is the only one possible and that the interval was only 206 years.

One of the latest accessible writers on the subject, the learned Dr. Hyvernat, of the Catholic University, Washington, writing in the Catholic Encyclopedia, adopts the calculations of the German school.

Setting aside, then, altogether for the present the details of the examine only the monuments and the Turin papyrus of kings, which list of kings and dynasties given by Manetho, the Egyptian historian, was written with full materials concerning this age, with a long list of kings, and only two or three centuries later than the period in question.

On the monuments are to be found the names of seventeen kings of the thirteenth dynasty. In the Turin papyrus there are the lengths of reigns of nine kings of this dynasty, amounting to sixty-seven years, or seven years each on an average. If this average length of reign is applied to only the seventeen kings whose reigns are proved by monuments, 120 years must be allowed to them, leaving out of account entirely about forty kings more of the same dynasty in the Turin papyrus, as being not yet known on monuments. Of the Hyksos, i. e., the shepherd kings of the sixteenth dynasty, the monuments of three are certainly known, and without here adopting the long reigns stated by Manetho, there must yet be allowed at

least ten years on an average; that is to say, thirty years for these kings. And in the seventeenth dynasty there are at least the reigns of Kames and Sekhent-neb-ra, which cover probably ten years. Hence for those kings whose actual contemporary monuments are known there is required:

Thirteenth dynasty, 17 kings, 120 years; sixteenth Hyksos, 3 kings, at least 30 years; seventeenth dynasty, 2 kings, 10 years—in all 160 years.

This leaves but 46 out of the 206 years to contain 120 kings named by the Turin papyrus and all the Hyksos conquest and domination excepting thirty years named above.

This is apparently an impossible state of affairs, and those who advocate this shorter interval are even compelled to throw over the Turin papyrus altogether and to say that within two or three centuries of the events an entirely false account of the period was adopted as the state history of the Egyptians.

This difficulty has been so great that many scholars in Germany and every one in the rest of Europe have declined to accept this view. If, however, the Sirius datum is to be respected, there must be allowed either 206, or else 1,666 years between the twelfth and eighteenth dynasties. As neither of these seemed probable courses, it has been thought that the Sirius datum itself was probably in error, and here the matter has rested awaiting fresh evidence.

At this point two Sinai monuments come in with decisive proofs that the Sirius datum is quite correct. Into the elaboration of those proofs space forbids us to enter, but it may be taken for certain that these two new data prove conclusively that the Sirius datum in the twelfth dynasty is correct and not liable to some misinterpretation.

And now to face this large question: Which of these two cycles of the 1460 year period, the earlier or the later, is to be accepted? It has been shown that there seems to be no possibility of the later period being true, as that leaves only 46 years free for all the large number of unknown kings of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties. Yet, on the other hand, one would shrink from the idea that there was as much as 1,500 years in this interval. There is one professed clue to settle the matter—the history of Manetho. Unfortunately, there are extant only some fragments of this history preserved in the writings of Josephus (antiquities, etc.), Julius Africanus (221 A. D.), (epitome) and Eusebius (326 A. D.) (prepar. evangelica). This writer compiled his history in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphos and very possibly for the great library which this king created in Alexandria, afterwards destroyed by the

Caleph Omar, to the great loss of scholarship concerning the ancient world. This work was in its original form an authority of the highest order. Compiled under the active patron of learning and written by an Egyptian priest who knew how to use all the documents that had come down to his day, it has the strongest claims to belief. Thorough and systematic the Egyptian records were, even in the fragments left to our times. The chronicle of all the years and reigns of the first five dynasties is unmatched in any country, and the fragment of it at Palermo shows how early a systematic record existed, while the Turin papyrus, of the eighteenth dynasty, or before, giving the length of the reign of every king, with summations at intervals, shows how the same taste for precise reckoning was kept up in later times. It was then to complete copies of such works that Manetho could refer when constructing his history for the Greek world. In this fragment of Manetho he refers to events in the history of the Egyptian kings back to those of the first dynasty and earlier.

The antiquity attributed to the Egyptian monarchy by Manetho seemed so incredible that many doubted its correctness and tried to explain it away by saying that the dynasties of which he speaks overlapped each other, or were contemporary with each other, rather than successive. The deciphering of the inscriptions of Sinai, together with the discovery of other monuments of those times, such as the tombs of the kings of the first six dynasties, go to prove the correctness of Manetho and the truth of the facts he relates concerning them.

Moreover, one of the documents discovered in recent times, the famous Turin papyrus, which testifies to have been written 1,200 years before Manetho's time, goes to show the absolute correctness of his statements, as well as the fidelity of the Sinaitic inscriptions, and all go to prove the fidelity of the monuments of that wonderful people, whose written records thus go back more than 7,000 years, a fidelity to which, particularly in the case of the chronicles of the first five dynasties, the records of no people or line of monarchs in modern times can approach.

Here is an example to show this correctness and that both Manetho and the Turin papyrus, written twelve hundred years before, or say 1,500 years B. C., drew from the same source.

The Turin papyrus gives 1,755 years for the first to the sixth dynasties and Manetho gives 544 years from the seventh to the eleventh, making in all 2,299 years, while Manetho gives 2,300 years as the total to the end of the eleventh dynasty. Hence he had exactly the same total for the first to the sixth dynasties, as we find given 1,200 years before in the Turin papyrus.

Manetho has been accused of double reckoning, that is to say, of giving two contemporary dynasties of kings (for there have been contemporary kings of Upper and Lower Egypt), as if they were consecutive. Every instance in which this has been supposed has broken down when examined in detail. Not a single case of overlapping periods can be proved against him. On the contrary, there are two excellent proofs of his care to avoid such errors. The eleventh dynasty is known by the monuments to have covered at least one century and possibly two, yet Manetho only gives forty-three years, evidently because he reckoned the tenth dynasty as legitimate, and until that ended he did not count the eleventh dynasty, which was partly contemporary with it.

Again, in the case of a single reign is found the same treatment. It is well known that Taharga was reigning about twenty-nine years before the accession of Psametek I. Manetho placed three ancestors of Psametek before him, reigning twenty-one years in all. Here, it has been said, is a clear case of double reckoning, of overlapping reigns.

But just here is Manetho's care shown, for he cuts down the well-known reign of Taharga to eight years (or 18, according to different readings), and this eight years with the 21 of the three other kings makes 29 of Taharga. In fact, he has only counted Taharga until he takes up what he regards as the legitimate line, and thus he ignores the 21 years of the reign which overlapped those of the other kings.

Starting from the well-fixed point of 1580 B. C. for the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, take Manetho as best represented by his earliest synoptic, Julius Africanus. His statements give for length of dynasties from the thirteenth to the seventeenth inclusive:

Dynasty.	Years.	B. C.
Eighteenth	1580
Seventeenth	157	1731
Sixteenth	518	2249
Fifteenth	284	2533
Fourteenth	184	2717
Thirteenth	453	3170

Admitting, then, the longer period of 1,666 years as approximate interval of the thirteenth to the seventeenth dynasties (there is a discrepancy of some seventy-six years, as can be seen, between the two computations, but this can be explained), and adding to this 1580 B. C., the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, the year 3246 B. C. is reached as the approximate date of the end of the twelfth dynasty. As this removes the chief difficulty which confronted the chronologists, under the guidance of the monuments, the Turin

papyrus and Manetho, there can confidently be assigned an interval of 2,264 years for the length of the combined reigns of the kings of the first twelve dynasties and give the accession of Menes, the first king of the first dynasty, as approximately 5510 B. C.—7,422 years ago.

And now to dispose of the Old World notion that the human race was created only 6,000 years ago, or 4000 B. C. Those who gave those computations were only commentators of Scripture, whether Jewish or Grecian, and the truth or falsehood of their computations in no way affects the truth or authenticity of the Scripture relations they treat of. The fact is, there is no chronology at all, strictly speaking, in the Bible. Not that the Bible does not tell us how many years the patriarchs lived, or how long the kings of Juda or Israel reigned. But that is not chronology in the proper sense of the word, and the Bible nowhere tells us in what year of the world this or that Scriptural personage was born or died, or that remarkable event occurred. The Old Testament knows no era, no point of fixed departure from which to compute other events, as, for instance, the birth of our Lord. It contains, indeed, chronological data, that is to say, elements of calculation which one can employ to construct a chronology, although no sacred writer presents a complete chronology. But even these chronological data are insufficient, and this for two reasons: first, because the true ciphers written by the sacred writers have not come down to us unaltered. This is seen by the divergence of 1,350 years between the chronology of the Septuagint and that of the Hebrew Bible, reproduced in our Vulgate. The Greek text, which is the most ancient version of the Old Testament, counts 2,242 years before the Deluge; the Hebrew and the Vulgate, 1,656. The Samaritan Pentateuch counts only 1,307. From the Deluge to the vacation of Abraham the Septuagint has 1,147 years, the Hebrew and the Latin 364 years and the Samaritan 1,017. Of those ciphers, so different, which are true? Are they not all altered? This is a question which no one can answer; criticism is impotent to resolve the problem. The Church has made no pronouncement.

Again, the Roman Martyrology, adopting the computation of the Septuagint, places the Creation 5199 B. C. Since the sixteenth century critics have succeeded in causing to prevail generally the chronology of the Hebrew text, which places the Creation 4,000 or so B. C. Thus the true ciphers written by the sacred writers have not come down unaltered.

In the second place, the genealogical lists given in the Bible are incomplete, and hence there are chronological pitfalls everywhere in the sacred text.

Take, for instance, the genealogy of our Lord as given by SS. Matthew and Luke. Matthew gives forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ, divided into three categories of an equal number of generations; fourteen from Abraham to David, fourteen from David to the transmigration of Babylon, and fourteen from the transmigration to Christ.

This was arrived at only as a result of the custom of the Jewish scribes, from whom the Evangelist copied (who looked for symmetry in their genealogical tables) to leave out unimportant links. Thus, in the present instance, he deliberately omits at one leap the triple link of the wicked Ochozias and his son and grandson, Joas and Amasias, and simply says, as may be seen (Chap. i. v. 8), "Joram begot Ozias," though Ozias was simply his great-grandson.

Again, St. Luke in the same genealogy of our Lord gives a link more than the Hebrew text and the Vulgate of the Book of Genesis, namely, Cainan. And this is the more remarkable, as it refers to one of the postdiluvian patriarchs. It is said in Genesis (Chap. xi., vs. 12-13), "Arphaxad lived thirty-five years, and begot Sale, and he lived after he begot Sale three hundred and three years." St. Luke says (Chap. iii., v. 36), "Sale, who was the son of Cainan, who was of Arphaxad." It is possible, then, that there are omissions in the list of the patriarchs as well antediluvian as postdiluvian, and this sole possibility of omission permits reply to all the objections that can be raised in the name of the divers sciences, history, archæology, paleontology, etc., against the Bible chronology. If science come to prove that the date which is generally assigned for the creation of man is not sufficiently remote, it will result that the systems of chronologists, of which there are nearly two hundred, are false; but the text of the Bible will remain always itself outside the controversy.

It can be seen, then, that the holy books are full of pitfalls for the unwary, and that there is in reality no chronology in the Bible to be adopted or contradicted, and that the sacred writers, who were bent on conveying to mankind the message inspired to them by the Holy Ghost, had no intention whatever to give to them the curious information as to what was or was not the age of the human race. Even the length of our Lord's public life is not known, whether it was one, two, three or fours years, and there are the names of learned and distinguished Biblical scholars who advocate each one of these periods.

Hence it is that the modern rationalists and higher critics are building for themselves a fanciful windmill to tilt their lances against when they build up a chronology for the Bible for the

pleasure of overturning it by invincible arguments drawn from antiquarian researches or scientific discoveries.

A. M. SKELLY, O. P.

Portland, Oregon.

CIVISM, CIVILITY AND URBANITY.

I.

SCHOOLS of philosophy are not wholly consistent: sometimes their inconsistencies appear to predominate, and then especially it is safer to say that certain doctrines are to be found in one or other of these bodies than to say that it is simply the doctrine of the body. With such reservation made, it may be taken that while Stoics held it to be the duty of a man to give his activities for the service of the State unless he could prove a right to special exception, Epicureans, though less anti-civic than the Cynics, would have been more inclined to pronounce that a call to civic service was the exception which needed to be established. This accords with the Epicurean watchword, "*Lathe beosas*," a theme which Plutarch develops in his treatise on "*Living Hiddenly*." The better cause assigned for such a life is not laziness or disregard of the public good, but the difficulty and the undesirability of pleasing the people who are so irrational and tend to demoralize the wise man. The Stoics here were not thoroughgoing. To their individual wise man, if he could be found, they assigned the right to judge for himself about Aristotle's dictum that suicide is forbidden by duty to the State.¹ On this suggestion no doubt many an individual would have claimed for himself the wise man's prerogative and have said in regard to his fellow-citizens what a modern writer has said, as if in maintenance of that Platonic Justice which lies in keeping to one's own concerns: "The wise mind their own business; they have a horror of interference. Suppose a man wants to leave this world? Ah, well, it is a pity; but it is his own life, and perhaps he has grown tired of it. So no one interferes. He minds his own business and his business is to be happy." So far did this writer, Samuel Butler, push the doctrine of testing a good man by the degree in which his life made for happiness that he wished the commonly accepted ethics to be largely modified by this

¹ It is not clearly said that Epicurus took his own life, but Seneca (Ep. 26) and Cicero (De Fin. I., 15) say that he left suicide optional.

² Stobaeus Florileg. vii., 25. Stoics also had the idea that the unhappiness of the individual mattered not if it contributed to make the universe happier.

standard. To the utilitarian standard the Roman Stoic Musonius set the limit that a man useful to many in life ought not to go out of it unless his death would be useful to still more.²

Another limitation of quite a different order arises from the contempt which Stoics professed for all material goods, and therefore for much that States deem of such prime importance that neglect of these interests would in their eyes ruinously upset their politics and oppose their doctrine of utilitarianism. Similarly they would judge with strong disapproval the Stoic rigor of abstinence from corrupt practices, from war and from the preference of one's own country before that of any foreigner.

If we recur now backwards to the predecessor of Stoics and Epicureans, Aristotle, he insists on the sociability of man as developed successfully in family, village and State.³ He measured all values teleologically by reference to the final end. Inasmuch as he placed this in contemplation and denied the sufficiency of "political life,"⁴ he might seem to make no provision for social welfare in the civil State; but he corrects this apparent one-sidedness by assigning a secondary value to material comforts. When he mentions openly the rival claims of public and private life he allows right to both; but on the whole his reply shirks a clear decision.⁵ He acknowledges that public service offers the widest field for those moral virtues that go to make the perfect and happy man, who is fully a man in his whole nature and not merely on his contemplative side. Still he has to concede that thereby contemplation is hampered. He compares the case with that of the best state which divides its efforts between its internal and its external interests. He sees in political virtue a repetition in larger characters of private morality without identification of the two regions. Machiavelli, on the contrary, saw here almost complete opposition, but would have called political expediences or necessities by the name of civic virtues opposed to private.

At any rate, the Greek in general regarded it a barbarism to let individualities anarchically triumph over civic harmony. Spartans in particular enslaved the citizen to the city; Athenians saw this and boasted their own comparatively greater liberality, as is set forth in the famous speech of Pericles.

II.

To-day much is made of civism as a thing to be taught from early schooldays, mainly, perhaps, as a lesson illustrated from other

² *Polit.*, cc. 1 et 2.

⁴ *Eth.* I., 5.

⁵ *Polit.*, cc. 2 et 3.

lessons, but also as a direct subject of instruction and exhortation. Boy scouts, cadet corps and similar organizations are used to enforce the patriotic teaching. It is desired also to lay hold of youths leaving school and enroll them in other bands, such as that of the British Boys' Training Association, for the defense of the country and for the promotion of its internal economy. In the smaller area municipal usefulness is demanded; in the village the parish needs its official and its unofficial helpers. If the town seeks urbanity, the country district wishes to escape the reproach of rusticity. So is formed in a larger sense that "civility" in praise of which Louis Stevenson has spoken: "This inbred civility, to use the word in its completest meaning—natural and facile adjustment of contending liberties—seems to be what is required to make us a governable nation and a just and prosperous country." Speaking of a party of clubable persons who got on so well at a house in which he was a lodger during his French travels, he remarks: "We wondered at the strange failure of the race upon the larger theatre."⁶ The party which he describes were at Fontainebleau, under a landlord who trusted to their honest dealing through control of their collective opinion, and left them pretty much to their selections out of his supplies in a most unbusinesslike way. Sitting up at night after "mine host" had retired, they went down to the cellar and brought up what they fancied. After a time the total consumption of drink was calculated and the expenses divided among the company, with a rough proportion of liabilities. A non-compliant member was dismissed. Bills were not presented till asked for and credit was freely given.

Those who look to the dark side will question the etymological rights of civility and urbanity. They will point to a basis of justice in the attacks made upon governments, parliaments, law courts, municipalities, parish councils and other institutions of the country. They will deny the urbaneness of our towns. They will say that the ideal state of civility is "a pattern laid up in heaven," not found in Babylon, or Nineveh, or Athens, or Rome, or London, or Paris. It was not on earth that the enthusiastic Emperor Marcus Aurelius could find his "dear city of Ceclops" converted into the "dear city of Zeus." St. Augustine's contrast will remain true between the city of God and the city of the world, and the city of civility will always be poorly verified in the cities of earth; the heavenly Jerusalem will be poorly verified in any Palestinian Jerusalem. At all times the laborer after improvement of town life will find an insuperably large task on his hands.

It may, however, be protested as a counter objection that the ideal of a heavenly city must always be fatal to a prosperous city of earth. Here we must distinguish precept from counsel. Religious

⁶ "Across the Plains," pp. 130-131.

societies founded on the renunciation of material wealth are not meant for the world at large: they form the higher following or "serving of one master," not the obligatorily prescribed form for all. When the excuses for not attending the Great Supper were made, no voice was raised in condemnation of them that man had no right to give time to his newly purchased lands or animals: it is a duty in its own place to be fulfilled by men of the world who are not condemnably wordlings. Least of all would the man who pleaded "I have married a wife and therefore cannot come" have improved his position by saying: "I have married a wife, but that is never a prohibitory consideration on my movements."

We must then allow its own value to natural civism and civility, and even ruralism of the better sort. Also we must not look too exclusively on their failures. Manners have been much improved by social life in towns. The larger intra-communion of the social units has its instructive, disciplinary and ennobling influences, which are given all the freer course by the excellence of the police, which removes the worst obstacles to progress. Where the turbulent elements cannot be controlled, the pioneers of civilization cannot make headway. Culture in the monasteries of Anglo-Saxon England was unable to achieve much success when any day the invading Danes might utterly ravage the homes of study in a way more fatal than companionship with street arabs undoes the efforts of town schools to give some polish to the boys and girls who are being educated. Still, a vulgar home life is a daily check on a more refined school life. All we can boast is that to-day the course of advancing civility in our towns is free from many hindrances that beset its path in mediæval and post-mediæval times, while the means of positive education are greatly multiplied in number and efficiency.

III.

We have thus in the terms Civism, Civility and Urbanity proposed to us as real objects of interest, which do not lie beyond practical attainment. But we should not rest too much in the external controls. The politeness of mere convention is liable to endless failures in the absence of internal charity. No man is unfailingly good-mannered who is not good-hearted. The occasions arise when human respect for the agreed-upon code ceases to exert pressure, and then the incivilities of the professedly polite men are often very noticeable and betray the want of genuine excellence. The defect is sometimes—which does not mean always—flagrantly illustrated

¹ Nevertheless even the Old Testament saw that a soldier was hampered if he had home ties; hence those were to leave the campaign who had newly built a house, planted a vineyard, betrothed a woman. Deut. xx., 5, 6, 7. Cf. I. Machab. ii., 50.)

in unexpected examples when the outwardly polite Englishman leaves his restraining society at home and has to do with uncultured races whose good or bad opinion he equally despises. For thoroughness of civility what we want is mutual support from inner considerations and outer pressure united.

On the side of the latter care has to be taken not needlessly to multiply conventionalities. Those who are born to elegant life and to assured position in society are apt to be much freer than those who try to rise to consideration by the long-detailed rules of the etiquette book, violation of which is so dreaded by the narrow circle of a small cathedral town, with its clerical and legal aristocracy, minutely criticizing each other and having the power to spread ill reports speedily all round its own confined area. In these days of easier traveling the tyranny of the petty circle is not what it used to be; but it has its terrors, and few individuals are strong enough to defy it with impunity. "You have never lived in the country," says one of Mr. E. F. Benson's lady characters to her girl companion, "with two aunts who were the daughters of a defunct dean. You can't understand the rules, you lucky person. If you have settled to go home on Wednesday, on Wednesday home you go, and nothing short of an earthquake may stop you. And the earthquake would have to be a bad one. Oh, Maud, we are alone, aren't we? If so, D—, but not otherwise."⁸ Of course, this imperfection of manner is not to be found in all daughters of deans, and of course some daughters of London fashion would be a great deal better if they had imbibed some of the discipline that they might have got in a clerical home at a cathedral city of small size.

All the same, it remains true that cultured manners are gainers by the absence of artificial rules which are quite unnecessary and do not contribute to real culture socially estimated. In a human intercourse, which must inevitably present many vexations, it is a pity needlessly to increase these exactions of a conventional etiquette, which only the stronger mind will be able to disregard and to bear the penalties of their disregard, judiciously and justifiably. Such justification does not hold against every artificial arrangement. Some conventions are absolutely necessary.

In conclusion, a remark may be made on the idea that the code of politeness, being a law, needs a penal sanction, which must be in the hand not of any official authority, but of the social group. In that fact lies a danger of some lapse into barbarism under cover of maintaining the higher civilization. For some of the social

⁸ Another utterance is: "The cathedral people are seven-day clocks; they strike with absolute regularity, and are wound up for the week at the cathedral service on Sunday morning. It is the spring and centre of their life."

penalties are apt to be much out of proportion and decidedly rough. Even the merely verbal castigations used to punish the manners of others easily turn out to be themselves very bad manners. No small part of etiquette should be not to offend by censure or reprisal, and under irritation, reasonably or unreasonably given, to keep a good temper and a spirit of charity. No ill-tempered, uncharitable person can ever be moderately civil. On the other side, no one, however good, can escape being inculpably the occasion of dissent and displeasure to others. Under such conditions of intercourse he cannot claim tolerance who does not practice it. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance, not desirous of vainglory, not provoking one another, not envying one another." (Galat. v., 23-26.) These "fruits of the Spirit" will produce a politer society than will any etiquette book applied from the desire to shine in elegance of manners as a fashionable adornment or as an advertisement for self-promotion.

JOHN RICKARY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN MODERN FRENCH FICTION.

Le dix-neuvième siècle a éparpillé
Le vingtième siècle unifiera.

—*Leon Daudet.*

La jeunesse est patriot, traditionaliste; elle se rit des nombreux Thalamas qui voulaient la modeler sur leur triste image.—*Maurice Barrès.*

IT is unfortunately the worst sort of French literature that gets most réclame outside France, just as many of the shadiest Parisian café-chantants draw their chief support from an Anglo-American audience, some out of curiosity to see how wicked the French really are! Vulgar and ignoble books are thus forced on the attention of the public, and most people are unconscious of the extraordinary *revirement* which has taken place in French fiction during the last ten years. It would be easy to cite fine books dealing with various problems, but here we must confine ourselves to works animated by specific Catholic ideals: works in which the authors seek to prove that in the Christian tradition lies the solution of the problems of individual and of social life, works in which religion is shown as a vital force influencing the lives of the characters, a source of strength in temptation, a source of consolation in affliction.

Among the works of older writers may be mentioned: "L'Étape," "Un Divorce," "Le Tribun," Paul Bourget; "Deracinés," "Collette

Baudouche," "Amities Françaises," Maurice Barrès; "Partage de l'Enfant," "La Lutte," Leon Daudet; "Blé qui lève," René Bazin; "Fils de l'Esprit," Yves Le Querdec. And among those of younger writers: "L'Immolé," "Fosse aux Lions," Emile Baumann; "L'Ivraie," "Les Egarés," "Lumière à la Maison," Jean Nesmy; "Yeux qui s'ouvrent," "Pays Natal," "Croisée des Chemins," Henri Bordeaux; "Les Arrivants," "Dame de Bourg," Jean Yole; "Dame des Levriers," "Avila des Saints," Alfred Poizat; "Ce qui demeure," Paul Renaudin; "Ascension," M. de Pomairols; "La Splendeur Catholique," Paul-Lœwengard.

Most of the literature at the end of the nineteenth century in France is marked by irony and skepticism, and the explanation is probably to be found in the following remark made by M. Maurice Barrès of his contemporaries: "Ah, qu'ils étaient médiocres mes compagnes les fils des vaincus! comme ils ont laissé retomber quasi éteindre les flammes françaises."

For a time after the defeat of '70 the thought of *La Revanche* and the national pledge of redeeming the lost provinces sustained the spirit of the French, but by degrees, owing to reasons which will be dealt with later on in this paper, the power gradually passed from the Catholic Conservative party into the hands of those who found in "Le Clericalisme c'est l'ennemi" a device much more to their taste, since it opened out prospects of great monetary gain from confiscated Church goods. The "sons of the vanquished," growing up in the subsequent atmosphere of materialism, drifted naturally into a state of dilettantism and *amoralism* and welcomed the theory that since religion, patriotism and duty were but words, the only attitude possible for a cultured youth was one of ironic fatalism.

Those to whom an ideal of some sort was a necessity found one in the doctrine of "Art for Art's Sake," according to which Art was the first and only law, and the entire duty of the artist was to give full expression to his inspiration without a thought as to the moral effect likely to be produced by his work. This doctrine of "art for art's sake" was interpreted by many as "enjoyment for enjoyment's sake," and not unfrequently its votaries in their pursuit of æsthetic sensations strayed into devious paths of vice. Writers in their anxiety to prove their superiority to "bourgeois morality" lauded everything abnormal to the skies; therefore, since the ordinary person associated beauty with health, they, as *conoscenti*, only found æsthetic pleasure in disease and ugliness, and disclaiming living flesh and natural colors, concentrated their attention on skeletons and putrefaction.

The pernicious effect of this perverse culture has been well ex-

posed by M. Paul Lœwengard in "La Splendeur Catholique," which appeared in 1910, and attracted great attention, as much by its fine literary quality as by the natural sensation caused by the conversion of the author from Judaism to Catholicism. Prior to his conversion, M. Lœwengard was famed in literary circles for his rather erotic pagan poems, and his case may be taken as typical of his time, proving as it does that it is by literature and art that the mind of cultured youth becomes inoculated with skepticism and vice. Not the least interest of the book is that in following M. Lœwengard through the many phases he traversed before he finally found peace in the Catholic faith, we see mirrored in rapid survey most topics of contemporary life. By turns *Baudelairien*, *Nietzscheen*, *amoraliste*, *anarchiste*, M. Lœwengard finally reached a period of negation in which he repeated with Pierre Loti:

"Je ne crois à rien ni à personne. Je n'aime personne ni rien. Je n'ai ni foi ni esperance. Rien n'existe de tout ce qu'on nous a enseigné à respecter. Il y a une vie qui passe à la quelle il est logique de demander le plus de jouissance possible en attendant l'épouvante finale qui est la mort."

If, however, M. Lœwengard is unsparing in his strictures on the literature of his time, which he states made him *un déséquilibré*, he also dwells on the potential power of literature for good and pays a special tribute to "Les Deracinés," by M. Maurice Barrès, which, falling into his hands one day by chance, made a deep impression on him and was the means of setting him on the right path.

Fortunately, all this chaos and materialism proved to be more *Parisian* than *French*, a distinction that many people lose sight of, taking Paris—or rather a small section of the capital—to represent France and forgetting that around the glittering centre, where these ephemeral creatures live their feverish hour of folly and of vice, stretch the fair lands of France, the reservoir of the nation's strength and permanence.

In time the proverbial *bonsens français* reasserted itself, and in considering the causes of the *revirement* which subsequently took place, it is of the utmost importance to realize that it has all sprung from national feeling. Patriotism is the foundation of French character, and amid the general débâcle of all generous convictions which, as has been indicated, followed the disaster of the Franco-Prussian War, the word *Patrie* never wholly lost its prestige, and from it, even in the absence of religion, could still be drawn the saving doctrines of heroic devotion and obscure self-sacrifice. Thus, when French writers saw that these subversive individualistic theories when put in practice produced a state of moral and social anarchy which threatened the very foundations

of their country, many of them, conscious of their own responsibility, cried "Halt!" and henceforth strove to guide the current of public opinion into safer channels. If we trace the evolution of those who now proclaim their adherence to Christian ideals, we generally find that it was love of country started them on their route of conversion: first they came to see the necessity of moral laws, then they realized that there can be no real moral force without religion, and thus little by little they were led back to the faith of their fathers. It is natural, therefore, that we should find these writers combating strenuously against the modern cosmopolitan spirit which saps the springs of patriotism by detaching the individual from the social group of which he should form part, sharing in that sense of responsibility without which life becomes rootless and ephemeral.

Before coming to the group of writers who may be described as *convertis*, honorable mention must be made of one who, unaffected by the anarchy raging around him, kept ever on the sane lines of Christian tradition. René Bazin is preëminently the novelist of provincial France, and his work is too vast to be examined here in any detail, though occasional reference will probably be made to one or other of his books. The art of M. Bazin, in its poetry, simplicity and truth, has produced literary types corresponding to the creations in art of the Barbizon painters, Millet and Rousseau, and in his novels, as in their pictures, the artist, while faithfully reproducing provincial France, reaches down to the bed-rock of life, and thus achieves the supreme distinction of being at once parochial and universal.

Among the *convertis* the names of M. Maurice Barrès and M. Paul Bourget stand out in special prominence. M. Maurice Barrès, known in the early nineties as one of the most audacious of the individualists who initiated the decadent *Culte de Moi*, is now an ardent advocate of Provincialism—i. e., the local patriotism of Brittany, Picardy, Lorraine and the other old French provinces, which is still alive, though more than a century has elapsed since the French Revolution and their nominal disappearance. M. Barrès is also a zealous defender of Catholic interests in the *Chambre des Députés*, on the grounds that experience has revealed to him that Catholicism is synonymous with social health and that it implies the most elevated sentiments, and also because he is conscious of the inseverable *points de suture* that unite France to Catholicism. It is much to be regretted that M. Barrès, who was indirectly the means of M. Lœwengard's conversion, does not himself seem able to take the final step which would make him a member of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

In "Les Deracinés" and all his subsequent works M. Barrès emphatically condemns the individualistic and cosmopolitan tendency of his previous writings and promulgates the *culte de la Terre et des Morts*, which advocates the strengthening of all the mysterious ties which in the obscure depths of the soul attach the individual to his race and country. At times readers are estranged by a certain narrowness in M. Barrès' outlook, but all who believe in the beneficial powers of nationality must be grateful to him for the many beautiful passages in "Les Amitiés Françaises" which describe the close union existing between a country and the native people. The aim of the book is to indicate the lines on which a Lorraine boy should be educated in order that he may grow up in harmony with his surroundings and thus become heir to the vast national inheritance which has accumulated during the course of centuries. Every land, M. Barrès believes, has her own music and only to her own children does she communicate this peculiar rhythm which puts them in communion with the living and the dead, awakening the sentiment of a common interest, so that each one feels himself a link in a great chain, a moment of something that is immortal.

Some people, as M. Barrès well remarks, think they have acquired much culture, when in reality they have only encumbered their mind with foreign matter that it cannot assimilate. However celebrated a work of art may be, it is valueless to us unless it is in sympathy with the natural rhythm in our souls. Hence, though our national culture may not be finer than that of other countries, it is of infinitely greater value to us, and it is an irreparable loss for a child to grow up out of his natural setting, as no foreign culture can ever compensate for the loss of that to which the deepest fibres of his heart would have responded.

In many other works of the present time we find writers dwelling on the sustaining force of nationality and the necessity of maintaining the spiritual bond which unites us to the land of our birth.

M. Henri Bordeaux in "Croisée des Chemins" illustrates the force of ancestral influences often lying dormant in our souls until awakened by some sudden emotion. The theme of "Le Pays Natal" is indicated by the title, and at the conclusion of the book, after recalling the legend of the giant Antious, who, fighting against Hercules, drew fresh vigor from the earth each time he touched it, M. Bordeaux thus finely expresses the solidarity of generations:

"Les hommes sont ainsi. En revenant sur le sol natal ils reprennent les trésors de passé et la foi dans l'avenir: car ils y retrouvent l'esprit des ancêtres et ils comprennent que toute œuvre durable dépasse la vie d'un homme."

In "Ascension," by M. de Pomairols, a remarkable book of elevated mysticism, embodying a sincere if discutable conviction, this same sense of the continuity of the ages finds beautiful expression in pages where the author describes the South Wind of his native place. This all-pervading breeze blowing at eventide across the plains penetrates every living creature, and enveloping the people of to-day in the same atmospheric influences as those breathed in by their ancestors, forms a bond of union between the successive ages.

"La Fosse aux Lions," by M. Emile Baumann—perhaps the most gifted of all the young Catholic writers of the present time—is pervaded by the rhythmic harmony existing between the earth and its natural workers, and the author's charm of style and ardent faith make the book a prose poem on rural life. It is to be feared, however, that only in *la vieille Vendée* would it now be possible for the hero Philippe de Bradieu to lead the patriarchal existence he desired, continuing the immemorial tradition of his ancestors who were at once the guardians of the faith and of the land. As in the case of the author's first novel, "L'Immolé," to which we shall return later on, exception has been taken to some of the passages in "La Fosse aux Lions." It would, however, seem that, while so many authors devote their talents to rhapsodizing over the pleasures of illegal passion, it can scarcely be amiss that a Catholic writer, who, as we shall see, does not hesitate to preach complete self-immolation when necessary, should here employ all the splendor and poetry at his command to depict the joys of Christian nuptials. In fitting conclusion to these notes on nationality may be given Philippe de Bradieu's noble ideal of patriotism: "De l'amitié entre les paroisses, un plus large amour pour cette paroisse plus large qui a nom la France et la plus large de tous pour la Chrétienté que la terre ne peut contenir parce qu'elle s'appelle aussi la Communion des Saints."

II.

Pour ma part, cette longue enquête sur les maladies morales de la France actuelle . . . m'a contrainte de reconnaître à mon tour la vérité . . . que "pour les individus comme pour la société le Christianisme est à l'heure présent la condition unique et nécessaire de santé ou de guérison."—*Paul Bourget.*

Plus j'ai observé notre époque plus j'ai cru voir que toute une part des maux dont nous souffrons venait de la méconnaissance de cette loi, formulée également par le catholique Bonald et par l'imperique Auguste Comte, par le romancier Balzac et par le naturaliste Haeckel: "L'unité sociale est la famille et non l'individu."—*Paul Bourget.*

M. Paul Bourget's later phase is more a *conclusion* than a *conversion*. Here and there throughout M. Bourget's writings there

are indications that he has not forgotten the Catholic faith of his childhood, and the attentive reader will realize that he was never duped by the brilliant cosmopolitan world he depicted so skillfully in his novels. Nor must it be forgotten that as far back as 1899 M. Bourget published "*Le Disciple*," a noble work, in which he expounded the thèse that the philosopher should be held responsible for the moral effect of his teaching. "*Le Disciple*" fell like a bombshell in a society which recognized no law but that of æsthetics, and it is proof of M. Bourget's sincerity that he should have risked his popularity by advocating a doctrine so antagonistic to the spirit of the time.

M. Bourget, having during twenty years maintained an attitude of analyst and consequently of searcher, finally concluded that man cannot live without laws strong enough to subdue the anarchy of his instincts and that the only law capable of such a miracle is Christianity. In the gradual crystallization of his convictions into a lucid whole there is no doubt that M. Bourget was considerably influenced by his visit to America, where the fine Catholic prelates he met during his stay much impressed him. Unfortunately, as we think, M. Bourget's religious development did not continue on the democratic lines the tone of "*Outre-Mer*" led his readers to expect. "*L'année terrible*" (1898) intervened, and one of the minor effects of *l'affaire Dreyfus* was that M. Bourget, perhaps in revolt against some unpatriotic theories advanced by socialistic leaders, became a convinced monarchist, an adherent of the school of Rivarol and Bonald, and of M. Charles Maurras, the brilliant founder of "*L'Action Française*." M. Bourget admits the autobiographical nature of certain traits in the early life of Robert Greslau in "*Le Disciple*," and this is completed by two of the chapters in "*L'Étape*:" that in which Jean Monneron relates to M. Ferrand the way in which he has been led to Catholicism and that in which we witness Jean Monneron's final acceptance of the faith in its entirety. It is certain that in these pages of penetrating beauty, lucidity and profound emotion the author reveals to us a personal religious experience. M. Bourget in his later phase has constituted himself the defender of the Christian family—as M. Barrès is the apostle of Provincialism—and in "*L'Étape*," "*Un Divorce*," "*Le Tribun*" and other works he has studied various points affecting the position of the family in the society of to-day. While the individual is ephemeral, the family constitutes the most powerful effort that man has conceived against oblivion, and in principle M. Bourget's doctrine is the same as that of M. Barrès, since in the "home," the centre of family traditions, lies the germ of that spirit of nationality which, as already urged, gives a sense of solidarity to the

individual and enables him to resist the disaggregating tendency of modern thought.

In "Marriage et l'Union Libre" (1904) M. Georges Fonsegrive lays stress on the way in which works of fiction—those of the Romantic as much if not more than those of the materialistic school—have furthered divorce by ignoring the possibility of conjugal love and by glorifying passion, which, it is suggested, should sweep all before it. It is therefore to be hoped that the literary reaction which has now set in will prove equally influential in checking the spread of divorce, which by attacking the indissolubility of marriage touches the foundation stone on which family life is built, since, as Auguste Comte has sagely said: "La seule idée de changement y provoque." It is certainly most encouraging that among M. Bourget's followers in this movement against divorce should be found M. Leon Daudet and M. Henri Bordeaux, writers eminently representative of their time. M. Leon Daudet, who has personal reasons for knowing that divorce is not the simple question it appears to legislators, in "Le Partage de l'Enfant" exposes the miseries of the child of divorced parents, and these are the significant words that he puts into the mouth of his hero:

"Je me repetais que seul le mariage indissoluble . . . parfumé d'éternité par un sacrement, garantit la destinée, humaine. . . . Il n'est pas douteux que mon avis soit partagé par tous ceux qui ont souffert du divorce, connu comme moi les affres de partage, la dissociation du sentiment familial. Le législateur antichretien a fabriqué sans s'endouter une génération plus prête qu'aucune autre à l'empreinte du dogme Catholique, ciment et condition de la famille. Le vague rêve des jeunes romantiques a pris chez mes contemporains cette forme précise: *des parents unis*. Tous, nous espérons eperdument à la reconstitution du foyer."

So, too, in "Les Yeux qui s'ouvrent"—one of M. Bordeaux's finest works—the theme is the primordial importance of the family. All the arguments that can be invoked in favor of divorce are based on consideration of the parents as individuals and fall to the ground when the family is considered in its integrity and perpetuity, and in "Les Yeux qui s'ouvrent," as in his other works, M. Bordeaux inculcates the doctrine, continuously urged by the Church, that in marriage the child is the first consideration, not the happiness of the parents.

It is to be regretted that in "Un Divorce" M. Bourget did not pose the question in its full force and simplicity and show the grave difficulties arising in the case of divorce and remarriage, which do not arise in the case of the second marriage of a widow or widower. In "Un Divorce" the problem would have been the same

had Darras married a widow instead of a divorcee, as the real conflict is between the atheist husband and a wife drawn back to the abandoned faith of her youth and tortured by doubts as to the validity of her civil marriage and the question of the religious training of her child.

In "Le Tribun" and "L'Étape" M. Bourget illustrates the danger of modern individualistic theories, and with an impartiality which does him credit draws in Portal and Monneron, high-principled Socialists, who are blind to the significance of their teaching until this is put in practice in their own families and causes general demoralization. Portal, surnamed the "Tribune" from his eloquence, contends in absolute good faith that the family, instead of being a support to the individual, is the chief obstacle to his development. Hence all his political measures, on inheritance, divorce and monopoly of instruction, are aimed against family solidarity, which must, he believes, be destroyed before any of the present social evils can be remedied. Each individual, Portal also argues, is a unit in himself and is alone responsible for his acts, of which he bears the consequences, good or bad. The catastrophe is caused by the fact that his son Georges—as Monneron's son Antoine in a similar situation—interprets this last doctrine as "every man for himself," and in pursuit of his own *droit au bonheur* he procures money for his pleasures by dishonest means, to the stupefaction of his austere virtuous father. Portal finally recognizes that it is his teaching that has indirectly caused the crime, and at the conclusion he comes to realize the truth that *la cellule sociale est la famille et non l'individu*.

Of "L'Étape" M. Bourget has said: "C'est ma pensée dans sa simplicité entière," and his subsequent works only develop the Catholic and Royalist convictions therein expressed. Even when we dissent from the author's social and political theories, we are obliged to admit that it is one of the chef d'œuvres of modern French fiction, written with a sincerity and nobility of purpose which entitle it to rank with "Le Disciple." The thèse of "L'Étape" is that social life must follow the laws which govern natural life, passing through each successive stage, and that any effort to accomplish at a stroke what should have been the gradual work of generations leads inevitably to disaster. M. Bourget illustrates his thèse by the tragedy of the Monneron family, caused by a too sudden change from a humble provincial home to the vortex of Parisian life. No one would wish to deny the difficulties attendant on any rapid rise of position, but we are chilled when we find that the author docket men off into various well-defined compartments in a manner more suggestive of theories elaborated in

the study than of truths realized in the more illuminating workshop of life. It is instructive of M. Bourget's mentality—if discouraging to those among us who are keen on the back to the land movement—that in his social classification he apparently considers that the peasant, the tiller of the soil, occupies the very lowest stratum, and evidently regards it as a marked social advance for a peasant family to arrive at the position of small shopkeepers!

“Si elles étaient dignes parleur vertus,” writes M. Bourget, “ces familles terriennes arrivaient à la petite bourgeoisie avec le temps. Puis de la petite bourgeoisie si elles continuaient à se fortifier elles montaient à la moyenne, à la haute, à la noblesse.”

And with each ascent in the social scale the author seems naively to imagine there accrues a corresponding accession of higher morality! Had such a desirable state of things existed there never could have been any social conflict, as those “on top” would naturally have been incapable of tyranny or any other abuse of the powers intrusted to them. In reality history shows only too clearly that while some aristocratic traditions are good and ennoble man, others are evil and debase him. As no class has the monopoly of intelligence, no class has the monopoly of morality. How, indeed, could it be otherwise when, as we find on examination, Christianity is the root of all sound tradition, and hence the principles of moral beauty are common to all classes.

The social *thèse* of “L’Etape” naturally raised a tumult of discussion, and M. Bourget subsequently modified his sentiments and admitted—in reply, it is comforting to note, to the protest of an aristocrat, M. de Haussonville—à propos of such cases as Guizot and Pasteur, that “le talent quand il est d’un certain degré échappe aux lois générales.” M. Bourget’s educational views are consistent with his general outlook. He approves of the widest possible extension of primary education, but would restrict rather than extend the limits of secondary education. In “L’Etape” the Union Tolstois is a somewhat caricatured representation of popular educational centres. M. Bourget with characteristic courage asserts that the *ouvrier* is not a primitive being with latent forces, but a civilized being of mediocre species, who, in the vast majority of cases, has arrived at the highest development of which he is capable. M. Bourget believes that an unbridgeable chasm separates those who work with their brains from those who work with their hands and thoroughly disapproves of all efforts at the fusion of classes, which, in his opinion, only lowers the one without raising the other. He is particularly severe in the person of Abbé Chanut on the priests who dream of reconciling democracy and religion.

M. Bourget, then, to sum up, is anti-democratic. He has no hope

that a suitable government can be evolved out of a democracy and places all his hopes in a restoration of the monarchy. We have given this resumé of M. Bourget's views because, unfortunately as we think, these are the views of the influential Catholic party in France, not only of the old aristocrats, but also of many of the most illustrious recent converts to the Christian tradition: M. Jules Lemaitre, M. Paul Lœwengard, M. Leon Daudet, who as a pamphleteer wields a pen of such bitter sarcasm that he has been compared to Swift; M. Charles Maurras and all the energetic youth of the Action Française; M. Maurice Barrès as a Republican-Nationalist occupies a position by himself.

The ideal of these writers is a Catholic monarchy, and in mistaken loyalty they form a bodyguard to what has been graphically described as "le cadavre de la royauté." They vow their allegiance to an indissoluble union of throne and altar and continue the conservative policy of the last forty years, which cannot be said to have benefited the cause of the throne, and which has certainly brought continual and needless defeats on the Catholic party.

On the other hand, we have in France democratic Catholic writers who, while fully realizing all the faults of the present government, devote their energies to trying to create a republic more worthy of the name. This democratic party continues to fight its uphill way, attacked fiercely on the one hand by all the anti-clericals, who realize that these are their most redoubtable enemies, and on the other denounced as deserters, if not traitors, by most of the Catholic conservatives. In the lamentable spectacle of Catholic parties expending in fraternal conflicts the forces so badly wanted against the common enemy, we must only get what consolation we can out of the reflection that agitation is a sign of life and that the pages of history show that in every state where there was vigor there was also enmity and strife between men fighting for the same cause and honestly believing that they were working for the well-being of their country and their faith.

Among these democratic writers it is proposed here to deal specially with the work of "Yves Le Querdec" and that of two young Catholic writers, M. Jean Yole and M. Jean Nesmy, as the social ideas in their novels fall in with the scope of this paper. Foremost place must naturally be given to "Yves Le Querdec"—the pseudonym which M. Georges Fonsegrive, professor of philosophy at the Lycée Buffon, adopts in his novels—who in "Fils de l'Esprit" (1905) concluded the study of social conditions from a Catholic point of view, already treated in "Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne,"¹ "Lettres d'un Curé de Canton" and "Journal d'un Eveque."

¹ Couronné par l'Académie Française.

As "L'Étape" expounds the principles of Catholic conservatism in France, "Le Fils de l'Esprit" may be regarded as the exposition of Catholic democracy, and the high intellectual gifts and well-known religious fervor of the author give a special interest to the opinions embodied in the protagonist, Norbert de Péchanval. An ardent patriot and deeply religious, Norbert gradually loses confidence in the methods of the Catholic conservative party, to which he naturally belongs by birth and education. He realizes that the only vital principle in the party is opposition to the anti-clerical policy of the Government, and that, united to destroy, the conservatives are without any constructive policy of their own and appear to think that all the problems of life would be solved by the mere substitution of a monarchy for a republic. Norbert's estrangement is completed when he finds that the conservatives have no idea of educating the people to *choose* a monarchy, and that their hope is to be able to force this on the country. For, he reflects, while it is possible that a hazard of fortune may overthrow the Republic and place some victorious general or dashing pretender on the throne of France, it is quite certain that unless such a man possessed the justice of a St. Louis, united to the genius and determination of a Napoleon, his popularity would be shortlived, and at the end of a few years all would be back in the old chaotic condition.

Catholicism, which is a living vital force, has had the misfortune of being too intimately associated in France with a party not merely conservative, but reactionary, whose chiefs appear incapable of imagining a future which is not exactly similar to the past. These traditionalists lay great stress on the fact that France has always been Catholic *and* Royalist, forgetting that though they the privileged class regret the whole edifice of the *ancienne regime*, this had its faults and grave injustices, which pressed heavily on the middle and lower classes. No small part of the misfortunes of the Church in France is due to the close alliance which formerly existed between it and the monarchy, so that when the Revolution came the Church, which had shared in political power, was regarded by many as part of the old tyrannical system. To this prejudice is still due the easy victory of anti-clericals at elections when, *adopting the very words of the royalists*, they dwell on the insoluble union existing between Catholicism and the monarchy, making the first responsible for the faults of the latter, to the great injury of our Church, which is universal and eternal, suited to all governments as to all nations and all ages.

The eloquent voice of M. Jacques Piou has before now urged his co-religionists to believe that by social reform and by that alone will they be able to reconquer the people, and this is also the conviction of M. Georges Fonsegrive as voiced by Norbert de Péchanval.

val in "Fils de l'Esprit." Failing a Catholic Social party, Norbert would prefer to see Catholics mingled with all parties in the *Chambre des Députés*, sitting wherever their political views were best represented and uniting in natural accord whenever a law affecting religion presented itself. Norbert therefore severs his connection with the Catholic conservative party, convinced that its failure is due to the fact that it is not inspired by a vital principle which, rooted in the soil, unites and strengthens a nation, but rather that it is the expression of an antiquated aristocratic creed maintained by the fostering zeal of its exponents.

Under existing conditions Norbert believes that the individual Catholic will best help in the national work of regeneration by depending on personal influence alone: by living among the people, by helping them to get social reforms, by proving to them that there is a solidarity of interests between us and that we are affected by their prosperity and by their want. The confidence of the people would thus be regained, class enmities would be dispelled and the influence acquired by Catholics would necessarily further in the most efficacious manner possible the cause of religion. "Le Fils de l'Esprit" gives a complete picture of the social conditions of rural France at the present time. In it we see Norbert putting his theories into practice, trying to conciliate conservative enemies, attacking the various anti-clerical influences undermining the country, and from his defeats as from his victories Catholics of all countries can learn useful lessons.

In "Les Arrivants" (1910), by M. Jean Yole, we find the same democratic ideas. M. Yole divides rural populations, putting aside those who by birth or influence belong to the governing class, into *les gens à l'aise et les besogneux*: the comfortably off and those who are needy. The needy, as we shall see when we come to the question of charity, are well looked after, but, as M. Yole points out, *les arrivants*, or rising men—perhaps the most important section of a community—are in many places lost to the Catholic cause through the *intransigence* of aristocrats, determined at all costs to maintain the class barriers of the *ancienne regime*. It would indeed seem that sometimes these conservative chiefs surround themselves with obsequious mediocrities in preference to accepting the valuable aid of rising men of talent who expect to be treated as social equals. Thus many of these *arrivants* who would have been only too glad to serve on the Catholic side drift into the ranks of our enemies because they find that they would be relegated to an inferior position in the conservative party. The old Marquis de Kerjoval is still representative of a considerable number of traditionalists who believe that perpetual failure is preferable to abating

an iota of class prejudice, and who decline to see any difference between a moderate republican candidate and a rabid anti-clerical, regarding all who are not "royalist and Catholic" as mere *canaille*. Of M. de Roydan, another conservative chief of much more reasonable views, Michel Renau, one of *les arrivants*, says:

"L'erreur de M. de Roydan, c'est d'allier en toute circonstance la cause royaliste à la cause religieuse. . . . Nous payons par la perte de nos libertés religieuses les essais unfructueux de nos chefs d'arborer le drapeau blanc. Nos législateurs franc-maçon le comprennent et comme ils ont intérêt à ce que l'équivoque persiste, ils refusent avec un soin jaloux à tous les Catholiques l'épithète de republican."

By vigorous propaganda the anti-clericals, aided by the action of the conservatives, have finished by impressing their ideas on the peasants, who in many places would give the definition, "a republican is a man who does not go to Mass." One evil result of this antagonism between the Catholic conservative party and the Republic is that the anti-clericals are able to penalize Government officials who continue to practice their religion, and another is that when in rural districts people abandon the Royalist cause they almost necessarily—so closely are the two united—abandon the Catholic faith as well.

In "Les Arrivants," as in "Le Fils de l'Esprit," we find it suggested that in private as in public life class distinctions should be at an end, and the marriage between Jeanne de Roydan and Michel Renau symbolizes the breakdown of too exclusive social barriers. So, too, the keynote of the new Catholic spirit is struck by Jeanne de Roydan when, in reply to an old aristocrat who regrets that he did not live in the more heroic days of the Crusades, when there was something worth fighting for, she declares that each age has its own heroism, its own crusade to fight for God and humanity.

III.

L'aumône n'est qu'une des formes de la charité, la plus facile à faire—Le pays demande autre chose.—*Jean Yole.*

Il faut que nous entrions comme un boulet dans la masse incroyante, qu'on sache bien que c'est nous vivons, qui sommes l'avenir, la dernière réserve des énergies.—*Emile Baumann.*

Dans chaque grande douleur accepté il y a un peu de la vraie Croix.—*Leon Daudet.*

These democratic writers urge the necessity of envisaging afresh the whole question of charity and point out that hitherto one of the great mistakes of Catholics has been to imagine that all social problems could be solved by almsgiving. M. de Roydan in "Les Arrivants" illustrates the very usual type of landowner who is

ever ready to give *charity*, but not *justice*, and the tragic thing is that he thinks to serve the cause of religion in maintaining the peasants on his land in a dependent position, looking to him for aid in sickness or misfortune, and therefore naturally obliged to lend an outwardly assentive mien to his political and religious exhortations. The days for such tutelage are passed, and almsgiving by its very nature can only affect the sick and the old. If, therefore, Catholicism is to remain a vital force in the world, it must, besides protecting the weak, apply itself to furthering the social reforms that the young and valiant members of the community are fighting for. The Church needs not weaklings, but strong soldiers, capable of radiating the faith around them, and many Catholics do not realize that just as dependence enfeebles the will, economic independence develops a sense of responsibility and is a valuable asset in character building. M. de Roydan would have better helped the religious cause he has so keenly at heart if instead of lavishing alms he had helped the tenants trying to help themselves, if he had augmented the wages of the peasants and made it possible for them to be self-supporting, if by the introduction of rural savings banks he had inculcated economy and protected them against the usurers, and, above all, if he had instituted those mutual insurance societies by which the poor, humiliated by always receiving, regain self-respect when they are made to feel that they in their turn are helping others. In too many cases almsgiving is found isolated, as it were, from the other precepts of Christian charity when it becomes little more than a gesture. In these books certain "philanthropic" persons of false piety and mechanical charity are mirrored, who seem to give with the tips of their fingers, so that those who receive feel that while "the well-filled purse is always open, the heart behind it is always closed," and the result is that the chasm between rich and poor is widened rather than bridged over.

M. Jean Nesmy, who is as democratic as M. Fonsegrive and M. Yole, is rapidly acquiring a prominent position among novelists in France, though little known in other countries. Each of M. Nesmy's works, it has been well said, is the act of a citizen, a patriot and a Christian. He is also an artist, and in his novels the characters, episodes and setting are in absolute harmony, so that we seem to be actual spectators of the scenes narrated.

In "*Les Egzrés*" (Couronné par l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques) M. Nesmy shows the dangers to which France is exposed by certain teachers whose three characteristics are: hostility to the Catholic religion, inclination towards Protestant individualism and indifference in matters of patriotism. Under fine-sounding

phrases of pretended humanitarianism they hide their egotistical desire to shirk the discipline and self-sacrifice which patriotism entails, and *neutralité patriotique* followed quickly on *neutralité religieuse*. Teachers have been found so scrupulous regarding individual liberty that they declared publicly they would not feel justified in speaking to pupils of duty, of conscience or of responsibility!

In "L'Ivraie" (Couronné par l'Académie Française), which deals with the tragedy consequent on the desertion of the country for the towns, M. Nesmy shows incidentally another way in which the modern teacher's idea of progress is likely to bring misfortune on France. In rural districts one would imagine that the chief aim of education would be to give the children knowledge that would be of use to them in their daily life, and by dwelling on the dignity and interest of agricultural life try and attach the more intelligent of the pupils to the soil and fill them with zeal to make two blades of grass grow where one had been before! Instead of that, we find—and the anomaly exists unfortunately in other countries besides France—that the education given is only suitable to prospective city clerks, while the tendency of teachers is to skim off the cream of country intelligence for the towns, with the result that countryside need workers and city slums are overcrowded. In perfect good faith, as shown in "L'Ivraie," schoolmasters pursuing a disastrous ideal of individualism think to further the cause of progress when they encourage their best pupils to desert the land, to break away from all the sober, restraining traditions of rural life, and, worst of all, to despise the patient resignation of the peasant who accepts the bad seasons with the good, and in storm as in sunshine continues that unceasing labor of the earth on which the whole edifice of life may be said to rest.

"You are leaving us," the schoolmaster in "L'Ivraie" says to Pascalou, who already half *deraciné* by his military service, longs for what he imagines to be the gay, easy life of towns. "The news does not surprise me. I have long expected it. You are intelligent and active and sure to get on. I am glad to hear that you are going to seek your fortune in the town."

Thus encouraged, Pascalou naturally regards the warnings of the old curé as the futile fears of "a reactionary" and departs for the town. There he flatters himself his individual existence will henceforth be secure whatever be the misfortunes of others. Let the storm rage as it list, let the vine perish, let the corn be blighted and the whole countryside be plunged into poverty, it won't affect him snugly sheltered in the city, where there is always wine and bread to be had in shops. Pascalou, starting in this frame of mind,

comes naturally under the worst influences of the town, and the story tells his gradual fall into vice and dishonesty. M. Nesmy, whose talent is akin to that of Charles Dickens and to that of the Russian novelist, Nicholas Gogol, excels in his descriptions of the joys and tragedies of the poor, and one of his most touching creations is that of Pascalou's mother, a figure of sublime maternal tenderness.

In "Les Egarés" and "L'Ivraie" it is the problems of rural life that engage the author's attention, and among other things he points out that Catholic social workers would do well to devote some of the energy now concentrated on the reformation of the artisan in towns to the moral and physical well-being of the peasant in those country parishes which are still the most precious reservoirs of the Catholic faith.

In "La Lumière à la Maison" (1910) M. Nesmy's touch is equally sure in dealing with the evils prevalent in industrial centres. In the person of l'Abbé Herluison we are shown the moral regeneration that can be worked by real faith, even in a citadel of Socialism, where workers are enmeshed in all the horrors of contemporary materialism. Abbé Herluison realizes the fact that the ministry of the priest in France to-day is quite different from that of yesterday and that what the Church needs now is not anchorites, but missionaries. Experience has proved to him that when priests withdraw into the sanctuary they unwittingly play into the hands of their enemies, who endeavor to push religion from all participation in public life and hope by shutting the priest within the shadow and silence of the Church to deprive him of all social influence. Like the Abbé Firmen in "Fils de l'Esprit" and l'Abbé Raymond in "Les Arrivants," the Abbé Herluison has no political views, but, like them, he considers that the wise course is to try and do the best we can under existing conditions and make bad laws as little mischievous as possible. Nor while recognizing the evils of the present government, would he allow that there was any incompatibility between a republic and Catholicism, pointing to the progress of the Church in America as a proof to the contrary. When the old Marquis makes gloomy predictions as to the future of the Church under the Republic, the Abbé reminds him that the Third Republic started under the supreme control of the Catholic conservative party, who gradually lost the confidence of the country by their repeated efforts to restore the monarchy. Catholics are themselves, therefore, largely to blame for the fact that the Republic subsequently developed on lines antagonistic to them. Had they from the start given loyal assistance in constructing the Republic, the result would probably have been very different. In his efforts

to make Catholicism a vital force the Abbé Herluison combats unceasingly the mental inertia of those who do nothing but lament over the misfortunes of the present time and regard the future with trembling, thus losing all initiative towards social reform. To Abbé Herluison's way of thinking, "Etre religieux c'est relier et non pas désunir," and his mission was one of gentleness and conciliation. He believed that it was a priest's duty to aid all, good and bad alike, and that there was no creature so fallen as to be unworthy of love. What he preached from the altar he put in practice in his life, and the result was that the beauty of his soul little by little spread its influence through his humble parish and produced a renaissance of Catholicism.

It is remarkable that such a prominent part should be taken by priests in these books dealing with social reform, all advocating the hopeful doctrine that no parish is so bad that the moral and intellectual character of the people cannot be raised by a priest inspired by a true apostolic spirit. Besides the priests already mentioned, three others demand special notice. No reader of M. René Bazin's beautiful book, "Blé qui lève" will have forgotten the admirable Abbé Roubiaux and the consoling symbolism of the concluding handclasp between him and Gilbert Cloquet—cette chose ancienne et belle et nécessaire: les mains de l'ouvrier mêlées à celles des prêtres. The Curé de Saint Just in M. Poizat's "Avila des Saints" is another valiant priest who actually creates a prosperous village around his once isolated church. Afterwards when anti-clerical agitators invade his peaceful hamlet and his flock fall from their allegiance, it is suggested to the curé that his life work has been wasted, but the old man never wavers, secure in his faith that all that concerns us is to sow the good seed, the result of the harvest not being our affair.

Above all others, however, stands the Curé X., who as the Curé de Saint-Julien² and later as the Curé de Saint-Maximen³ is the protagonist who voices M. Georges Fonsegrive's schemes of social reform, which have doubtless been the source of inspiration of many of the younger writers we have named. The Curé X. considered that charity consisted in relieving suffering of all sorts, physical and spiritual, and that there were many other miseries besides that of needing bread. All that is just, he reflected, is necessarily pleasing to God, and it would be strange indeed if the Church were to ignore the sufferings of the poor, leaving to her adversaries the task of defending them. It is not because in Paradise all earthly wrongs will be made right that we should fold our hands

² "Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne" (Couronné par l'Académie Française).

³ "Lettres d'un Curé de Canton."

here below and look on at these injustices. The Church preaches resignation to all inevitable suffering, but she must not seem in any way to uphold oppression or exploitation of the people's labor. Further, the Curé X. believed that prevention is better than cure, and besides relieving present suffering and want, he sought to root out their causes, and thus ameliorate the future. Curé X.'s progressive ideas bring him into great disfavor with the influential conservative Catholics of the neighborhood, and when he institutes *caisses de credit* to secure the poor against the tyranny of usurers and temperance societies to combat the other evil of alcoholism, he draws the fury of all the money-lenders and publicans upon himself. Attacked on all sides and with little evidence of any real good resulting from his labors, the Curé X. realizes the whole magnitude of the sacrifice required of him, but he never falters. He knows that it is not for him to think of what the consequences to himself may be; he is there for the salvation of his flock, a tool in the hand of God and *le fer ne doit pas avoir peur d'être froissé*, it is intended that it should wear out in the service of the Master.

The Curé X. dies a victim to his zeal, and it is his death that accomplishes the reformation he so longed for in his parish. "Yves Le Querdec" wishes, we infer, to emphasize the beneficial action of voluntary sacrifice. It is one thing to say that one would willingly give one's life for the people and another thing altogether to actually put this in practice, and, like the Curé X., expend one's life force in fighting the cause of the poor. The author further illustrates his belief in the radiating power of goodness by making one of the Curé X.'s disciples, Abbé Firmen, the reforming spirit of his later novel, "Le Fils de l'Esprit," where in his turn Abbé Firmen passes on to others the good seed he has received.

This belief in the efficacy of self-sacrifice preoccupies other writers, notably M. Emile Baumann, the theme of whose first novel, "L'Immolé" (Couronné par l'Académie Française), is that men may offer themselves as voluntary holocausts one for the other. "L'Immolé," a work of great originality and beauty of language, attracted widespread attention on its appearance in 1909, and the story of Daniel Rovere's struggles and final triumph is too well known to need repetition here. Some people have made it a matter of reproach to the author that a book inspired by such mystic fervor and dealing with the vicissitudes of a soul in search of perfection should also vibrate with powerful human passion, and it is certain that the vivid imagery of some of the scenes would make it difficult to present the book in an English form. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the object of the writer is to represent the eternal conflict between Christian sentiments and the desires of

the flesh and to trace the gradual triumph of the higher aspirations of the soul over the baser instincts. If in depicting Daniel Rovere's falling away from grace the force of these instincts had been veiled, his subsequent self-disgust and remorse, which the author has so eloquently described, would be incomprehensible. Catholic fiction contains few more illuminating pages than those in which M. Baumann has depicted the night of anguish in which Daniel Rovere fought out the final struggle between his passions and his religious belief. He realizes that for him salvation is only to be found in a complete immolation, and in a free gift of himself, absolute and beyond recall, he at last gains dominion over his passions and a sense of peace that he had never known before. It is as though a veil had been drawn from before his eyes, and the author's own words best describe the wonderful vision he has of the vast communion of the Catholic Church and the universal law of sacrifice:

"Le sacrifice est la vie du monde, depuis l'herbe immolé sans le savoir à l'agneau qui broute, jus qu'à l'Homme-Dieu qui a renové, qui renove la terre par le Sang des Justes des Martyrs, et par le Sien. . . . S'immoler, ah! c'était Dieu la loi unique, la loi implacable et douce. Dans cette nuit amère, qui decherrait pour lui le rideau des apparences, il decouvrit mieux qu' à nulle heure de son passé, l'immensité des immolations silencieuses. Et ces holocausts étaient beaux, il étaient justes ils étaient saints; car ou bien la souffrance avait une valeur infinie de redemption et de bonté ou bien le monde ressemblait à une gehenne absurde, à un abattoir nauséabond. Il suivait depuis les racines de l'ordre, crée, le sacrifice permanent des faibles. Seulement les pierres, les arbres, les bêtes subissaient sans pouvoir murmurer cette alternance terrifiante et divine. Lui au contraire, il se savait libre de l'accepter dans l'amour ou de blasphemer contre elle, et il l'acceptait en communion avec le Christ. Le Christ seul était la victime parfaite, parce qu'il a pleinement voulu l'être."

"L'Immolé" is perhaps not a book for *la jeune fille*, but all who know something of life cannot fail to be fortified by a work which really makes us feel the force of Catholicism in controlling passions and stimulating for good. At the conclusion of "L'Immolé" Daniel Rovere is seriously injured in trying to prevent an anti-clerical mob from wrecking a church. Offering himself in voluntary sacrifice, he stands barring with his outstretched arms the entrance to the sanctuary, so that to many of the attackers he suddenly appears to be a living symbol of the Cross, and M. Baumann's conclusion suggests the moral already given by "Yves Le Querdec" in "Lettres d'un Curé," that self-immolation is often fruitful in good works.

In conclusion, another novel inspired by the belief in the value of accepted suffering must be mentioned.

"La Lutte," by M. Leon Daudet, with the sub-title "Le Roman d'un Guerison," is a painful, and sometimes unpleasant, work relating a man's gradual ascent from materialism to Catholicism. The hero, whose case is diagnosed for us, is a typical Parisian, accustomed to every form of self-indulgence until, attacked by symptoms of tuberculosis, he suddenly becomes isolated from his fellows and told that on himself and on his own powers of self-discipline and energy depend his recovery. From childhood surrounded with the gayety and sociability of cities, he now for the first time in his life is alone, and thrown thus upon his own resources, finds that he has no firm principle that he can hold by. Acting on the evil counsel of one of his friends, he starts taking opium to help him through his fits of depression, and, falling under its influence, has two enemies to combat instead of one. In the early days of his malady he is much astonished when one of the specialists he visits asks whether he is *croyant*, and on his giving a reply in the negative, hardly understands the doctor's remark that this is a pity, as he has often noticed that in such cases believers resist better—*"C'est un escalier à remonter et ils ont une rampe."*

Afterwards he comes to understand that while skepticism predisposes to decay, faith puts man in touch with the Infinite and enables him to appeal to and be sustained by superior forces. In his enforced isolation he sees the folly of his past life, lived liked a sleepwalker, and "La Lutte" relates his ascent and final cure—the spiritual hygiene of the soul aiding the physical hygiene of the body—first of the opium habit and then, in courageous acceptance of suffering, the healing of his lungs. He looks back without regret upon his illness, which has revealed to him those higher truths without a knowledge of which "man is but a talking animal" and which has given him that comprehension of the miraculous which enables him to contemplate undismayed the world of stars. As the old monk at the monastery where he has completed his cure says to him at parting: "Your two years of agony have been profitable to you, my son! In place of the pagan that you were, they have substituted a Christian. In all great suffering borne with resignation there is a little of the True Cross."

A. MACMAHON.

London, England.

WERE THE "ARTICLES ORGANIQUES" PART OF THE
CONCORDAT OF 1801?

THERE are very few people of to-day who do not know that there have been religious troubles in France for many years past. Not so many, however, know precisely how it was that these troubles came about. Most people would be surprised to hear that the trouble arose about an agreement made between France and the Holy See as far back as 1801. When, in 1905, the Rouvier Ministry broke up this compact by decreeing the separation of Church and State, the reason given for the action was that the rupture was forced upon France by the simple fact that the Pope refused to recognize the obligations imposed on him by the Concordat. To this the Vatican immediately replied: "With the obligations imposed on us by the Concordat we have always complied. But the obligations which you wish us to carry out are not contained in the Concordat; they are contained in the Articles Organiques. To any obligation arising from this source we are, of course, in no way bound, since these articles were never agreed to by the Holy See or its representatives, nor did they form any part of the Concordat of 1801."

We do not assert that every single one of the questions at issue between France and the Holy See in the beginning of the present century was concerned with the Articles Organiques. The two main disputes were: Firstly, Did the Pope possess the right to refuse canonical institution to any particular candidate whom the French Government nominated to a bishopric? This question does not come within the scope of the present article, since it touches an article of the Concordat, or rather the interpretation of an article. The second point at issue, however, namely, whether the Pope possessed the right to summon any of the French Bishops to Rome without any permission from the Government, is the one that concerns us now. For there is no question of this in the Concordat, but there is in the Articles Organiques. That Pope Pius X. violated this article is certain, that the French Government denounced him for doing so is equally true, and that this action of the Pope was one of the chief arguments used in favor of the Law of Separation is a fact known to all who followed the proceedings in the French Parliament.

When, therefore, we inquire whether the Articles Organiques formed part of the Concordat between France and the Holy See, we are not plunging into an abstruse historical question, the solution of which is of no great value to-day. We are really asking whether

the French Government or Pope Pius X. is to be held responsible for the separation of Church and State in France. For if the Articles Organiques were part of the Concordat, there is no denying that the twentieth article was openly violated by Pius X. when, on the 2d of July, 1904, he summoned the Bishop of Laval to appear in Rome within fifteen days, making no provision whatsoever in case the Government should refuse him permission to leave his diocese. If, on the other hand, the Articles Organiques formed no part of the Concordat, then it must be admitted that at least one-half of the arguments brought forward by French politicians against the Church may be regarded as worthless. Whether the Concordat and the Articles Organiques were one and the same treaty is, therefore, the important question we purpose solving in this article.

Every one possessed of the most elementary knowledge of French history knows quite well that in the beginning of the last century religious affairs were not in a flourishing condition in France. The Revolution, it is true, was at an end, anarchy was crushed, but its devastating tracks still remained. The priests had been slain, the churches burned, the monasteries and convents turned into barracks. France may be said to have entered upon an entirely new phase of existence, in which its past was entirely forgotten. Under such circumstances a new Concordat became a necessity, for Napoleon, to give him his due, never wished to destroy religion. On the contrary, he was inclined to protect and foster it, provided, of course, that the Church never in any way dared to interfere with him.

By the mutual desire, therefore, of Pope Pius VII. and Napoleon a conference was held at Paris in 1801 for the purpose of determining the relations between Church and State in the new Empire. The drawing up of a Concordat is no easy task, for concordats invariably imply a felt divergency between the two contracting parties, neither of which is inclined to give way in any detail to the other. Still, in the present case things ran smoothly enough. There was no serious dissension between the representatives of the two powers, and as early as July the negotiations were completed, a treaty was drawn up and signed by Consalvi, Corinthen and Caselli on behalf of the Pope and by Jerome Bonaparte, Cretet and Bernier on behalf of the Emperor Napoleon.

Glancing over the seventeen articles of the Concordat, it may be said that on the whole the Church fared well, the different articles giving her fairly free scope to develop her divine mission and imposing on her no very offensive obligations. They might, of course, have been better, but the troubled state of France at the time had to be taken into consideration, and Pope Pius was doubt-

less not without hope that when things had settled down any causes of friction might, by a little mutual good will, be eliminated. But even as it stood the Concordat was a satisfactory treaty, containing nothing whatsoever contrary to the faith or discipline of the Catholic Church.

To one man, however—a very powerful man in France at the time—the satisfactory terms obtained by the Papal representatives occasioned great wrath. This was the infamous renegade, M. de Talleyrand. No sooner did he become acquainted with the terms of the Concordat than he immediately proceeded to draw up a code of articles which completely nullified the advantages gained by the Church. These articles were first known by the name of the *Arrêté d'Organisation*, but later on they came to be called the *Articles Organiques*, the name by which they are always known now.

There is no denying the fact that when the Concordat received the ratification of the French Legislative Assembly the original compact and the *Articles Organiques* were presented together, just as though they were one and the same treaty. But we must bear in mind the fact that the Concordat was drawn up and signed in July, 1801, but was not presented to the Legislative Assembly till April, 1802, and during the nine months that elapsed between these two dates the busy brain of Talleyrand could have accomplished much. The question to be solved is therefore, "Were the *Articles Organiques* drawn up during this time, and in consequence entirely unconnected with the Concordat and unknown to the Papal representatives?"

The answer to this question may be drawn from two sources—from theology and from history. We enter on the theological argument first, for though it is of itself more convincing than any historical proof, it is an argument which will have little weight with non-Catholics. For it presupposes uniformity and consistency on the part of the Church—suppositions which our separated brethren are not always willing to concede. In their opinion, the Church is consistent in nothing but inconsistency, and hence to tell them that Pius X. teaches a certain doctrine by no means proves to them that Pius VII. did not teach the very opposite. Consequently, the theological argument, though convincing to Catholics, will convince them only, but we will afterwards bring forward the stern facts of history to prove our case to the most incredulous.

Nobody denies for a second that in difficult circumstances the Pope would be willing to concede much to a lay power; but, on the other hand, every Catholic knows that there is a limit beyond which the Pope would not or could not yield. Beyond all doubt, this limit has been more than once exceeded in the *Articles Organiques*.

The very first of the articles furnishes us with such an example. It runs as follows: "No bull, brief, rescript, mandate, provision or other document coming from the Roman Court, even though it only concern particular individuals, can be received, promulgated, published or otherwise enforced without the permission of the Government."

It is impossible to conceive that to such an article in that form the Papal representatives could ever have agreed. For any one can see what precisely it means. In the event of any friction between Church and State, the Pope would have to go to the Government and ask its permission to make his views known to the faithful. Let us take an example from what actually did occur later. The Government ordered for use in the schools books which were condemned by the Congregation of the Index. In such an emergency, then, the Pope, or his Legate, would have been obliged to go to one of the public officials and put him the question: "May I please tell the Bishops that they must strictly forbid the children to read the books which the Government has ordered to be used in the schools?" We can quite well imagine what the answer would be.

The third article forbids the publication in France of the decrees of general councils "until the Government shall have examined their form and their conformity with the laws, rights and liberties of the French Republic." If, therefore, the French Government chose to hold, as it does hold to-day, that matrimony, for example, is a thing entirely under their control, no Pope or general council should dare to tell the Catholics of France that the Church regards as nothing of the kind, but as one of the seven sacraments, and as such under her sole control.

But bad as are these articles, it can at least be held that they do not absolutely and necessarily run counter to faith. They certainly place the Church beneath the heel of the State, and for our part we do not believe that any Pontiff would ever consent to them. Still worse, however, was to come. The twenty-fourth article is of such importance that we give it in full:

"Those who shall be selected to teach in the seminaries shall affix their names to the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682 and published by edict the same year; they shall undertake to teach the doctrine which is contained in that declaration, and the Bishops shall send a formal notification of this undertaking to the Councillor of State, in charge of all matters concerning public worship."

It would be too long a task to enter into a full history of the declaration referred to. It consisted of what are known as the

"Four Articles" and was the offshoot of a controversy between Pope Innocent XI. and King Louis XIV. Though not actually containing heresy as they stand, they unquestionably lead to it when pushed to their legitimate conclusion. For the whole scope of these four articles was to reduce the Papal authority to zero and in its place to substitute the authority of the King. The four articles, therefore, knocked into one might be written thus: "Whenever the Pope and the King quarrel, whether the question at issue be purely religious, purely political or containing an element of both, the King is invariably right, the Pope invariably wrong." Such was the doctrine which every ecclesiastical professor in France undertook to inculcate into the future clergy of the country, according to the Articles Organiques. And to such an article, we are told, three Papal representatives—one of them Cardinal Consalvi—gave their assent.

But even all this pales into insignificance when we read the fifty-fourth article, which runs as follows:

"They (the priests) will only give the nuptial blessing to those who shall prove in right and legal form that they have contracted marriage before the civil authority."

It must be admitted that in this article Talleyrand overdid it. To hold that the Pope, through his ambassadors, sanctioned the fifty-fourth of the Articles Organiques is so utterly absurd that it is almost surprising that this article was ever put in. For it is merely the expression of a veteran heresy which has cropped up over and over again and has as often been condemned by the Church. The heresy is that the sacrament of matrimony consists in the blessing given by the priest. This is directly contrary to the doctrine of the Church, which is that the sacrament and the blessing are two not merely distinct, but even separable things, since the sacrament consists in the contract between the two parties, which contract can, and frequently is, made without the conferring of any blessing. Now marriage in the article we have quoted evidently means the matrimonial contract, in which precisely consists the sacrament according to the teaching of the Church. And this was to be performed not before an ecclesiastic, but before a representative of the civil authority. French politicians, therefore, would have us to believe that Pope Pius VII. either held the sacrament of matrimony to consist in the nuptial blessing, or else admitted that over one of the sacraments the State and not the Church had control. If the Pope admitted the first hypothesis, he ran directly counter to the Council of Trent, which admitted the sacramental character of clandestine marriages contracted up to that time, for in clandestine marriages no blessing at all was given. If he admitted

the second, his teaching was diametrically opposed to what every other Pope, before and after him, has laid down, and truly the Articles Organiques of Pius VII. put matrimony on a very different footing from the "Ne Temere" of Pius X. How many will believe that a man of the highest order of ability like Consalvi walked blindly into this ridiculous heretical dilemma?

Such is the substance of what may be called the theological argument against the Articles Organiques. We do not for a second mean to assert that the articles we have commented on are the only ones to which offense could be taken. But they are perhaps the most offensive, and they are quite sufficient to prove to all Catholics—without any appeal to history—that at least some of these articles could not by any possibility have been sanctioned by the Holy See.

But when we open up the pages of history and inspect its stubborn facts, what a glorious vindication of the Holy See we find; what a wholesale condemnation of the French Government of to-day.

At the very outset we have what lawyers would call a *prima facie* argument against the genuinity—as we will call it—of the Articles Organiques. To the seventeen articles of the Concordat are affixed six names, three representing the Pope and three the Emperor; to the Articles Organiques are affixed no names at all. How does this happen? Men do not usually sign their names when they are halfway through a letter, and it is difficult to understand how those six learned diplomats came to affix their signatures at the end of the seventeenth article and then resumed their places and compiled seventy-seven more. Nor is this the only irregularity that can be noticed. From the beginning to the end of the Concordat there is not a single word of French, the language throughout being Latin; from the first to the seventy-seventh of the Articles Organiques not a single Latin word or phrase is used. This may not, indeed, be a convincing proof that the two were not drawn up by the same parties, but it certainly is a little fact which requires some explanation, and it has never received it.

Fortunately, history supplies us with more undeniable reasons for impugning the genuinity of the Articles Organiques. There was, it is true, no immediate uproar and protest against them after the signing of the Concordat, for the simple reason that they did not exist at the time. When exactly they were drawn up and by whom no one can say with absolute certainty. It is very probable that they were drawn up between July, 1801, and April, 1802, and the credit of drafting them is usually given to Talleyrand.

One thing is quite certain, that Pope Pius VII., according to his own clear words, heard or knew nothing about them till they were

publicly sanctioned and promulgated in April, 1802. At the very next Consistorial, held on the 24th of May, the Pontiff, while expressing his joy at the successful conclusion to the negotiations between the Holy See and France, disclaimed all knowledge of the Articles Organiques, against some of which he strongly protested. "We notice," said His Holiness, "that, together with our compact, there has been promulgated also a large number of other articles of which we had no knowledge whatsoever. We, in accordance with the traditions of our predecessors, can only hope that opportune and necessary changes will be made in them. We shall exert our whole influence with the First Consul to obtain this from his sense of religion. We have good reason to hope that we shall succeed, both from the character of the First Consul himself, as well as from that of the French nation, as full of wisdom and penetration."

We may remark that the Pope's words, "opportune and necessary changes," describe exactly the Vatican's attitude to the Articles Organiques. To some of them no objection could be taken; more could be rendered acceptable by clear explanation and the removal of some ambiguous phrases; others should be absolutely and entirely struck out.

In the meanwhile the articles were subjected to careful consideration in Rome, as a result of which a strong protest was dispatched, on the 18th of August, by Cardinal Caprara both to M. de Talleyrand and M. Portalis, the Councillor of State. In the opening passages of his letter the Cardinal expresses himself thus:

"I have been instructed to protest against that part of the law of 1801 which is known by the name of the Articles Organiques. I fulfill this duty with the greatest confidence, since I rely upon the good will of the Government and upon its sincere attachment to the true principles of religion. The character which is given to these articles would lead one at first to suppose that they are nothing but a natural consequence and merely an explanation of the Concordat. Nevertheless, it is true that they have not been drawn up in concert with the Holy See, that they have a much wider range than the Concordat and that they establish in France a code of ecclesiastical laws without the concurrence of the Holy See. How could His Holiness accept such a thing without having been invited even to examine it?"

Nor was the drawing of a clear distinction between the Concordat and the Articles Organiques a thing confined to the Vatican. Public opinion in France was just as firmly convinced that the two codes were entirely unconnected. This we know from a letter which Cardinal Fesch, the Papal Legate at Paris, wrote to Cardinal Consalvi on the 26th of May, 1802. In this letter the Legate says:

"With regard to the Articles Organiques, I am glad to be able to assure you that every one is convinced that they have not the slightest relation to the Concordat and that they have been drawn up without the express or tacit consent of the Holy See or its ministers, or still less of myself. For I indeed have lost no opportunity of breaking the bonds wherever these articles fetter either the Church or its ministers."

When the Articles Organiques were for the first time officially presented at the Vatican by M. Cacault, the Ambassador to the Holy See, the ecclesiastical authorities demanded an explanation of their being added to the Concordat. The explanation which he gave M. Cacault himself communicated later to Talleyrand:

"As to the Articles Organiques," wrote the Ambassador, "I have been obliged to explain that they have not been published as though drawn up in agreement with the Pope; that they were the work of the Government, which possesses the right to make them and which uses its right in this manner through regard for our laws."

That the French Government possesses the right to legislate for its subjects no one will deny, but that it possesses a right to add its own clauses to a treaty with another power and take it for granted that the other power, without being consulted, will agree to them, is not quite so easy to see.

In his reply to the protest of Cardinal Caprara, which we have already quoted, M. Portalis flatly gives the lie to those who assert that the Concordat and the Articles Organiques were drawn up by the same parties. For in the course of his letter the Councillor of State says:

"I am fully aware that the Articles Organiques are the work of the civil power alone. I admit that, though the Holy See has been one of the contracting parties in the Concordat, it has had nothing at all to do with the Articles Organiques. But on this point there cannot be any misunderstanding, for the Pope, or rather his representatives, have signed the Concordat, but their names are not affixed to the Articles Organiques. The Concordat is a treaty, the Articles Organiques are a law; it is impossible to confound objects which bear no resemblance to each other."

We would wish indeed that the words of M. Portalis had proved true. Unfortunately, complications and misunderstandings did arise later on, and the violation of one of the Articles Organiques by the Pope was one of the chief reasons given for breaking up the Concordat.

A quite unforeseen event brought forth an expression of opinion on the point from Talleyrand himself. Preparations were going on at the time for the coronation of Napoleon as Emperor at Notre

Dame, which ceremony was to be performed by the Pope. As is usual on such occasions, an oath was drawn up for the Emperor to take, which oath was nothing but a brief outline of the Constitution, which the Emperor pledged himself to defend. With regard to religious matters, the oath to be submitted to Napoleon obliged him "to defend the Concordat and the laws of the Concordat." Under the circumstances the Pope could not consent to crown Napoleon until he had received a definite guarantee that the Articles Organiques were not what was meant by "the laws of the Concordat." Cardinal Caprara therefore wrote to Talleyrand informing him that Napoleon's wish could not be complied with until these ambiguous words were explained. If by the laws of the Concordat, wrote the Cardinal, were meant the Articles Organiques, the Pope could not in conscience be present while such an oath was taken.

On the 18th of July Talleyrand replied, and nothing could be more explicit than his words about the Articles Organiques. "The laws of the Concordat," he said, "are essentially the Concordat itself. The Concordat is the expressed will of the two contracting parties. The organic laws, on the contrary, are but a line of action adopted by one of the two parties. This can be changed and bettered according to circumstances. These two things cannot, therefore, be justly comprised in the same expressions. The words 'the laws of the Concordat' do not for a second imply a piling together of the Concordat and the organic laws."

Talleyrand's reply was immediately communicated to Cardinal Consalvi, who in turn made it known to the Pope. The good impression created at the Vatican by Talleyrand's words and the hopes drawn from them that the Articles Organiques would be knocked into an acceptable form were set forth by Cardinal Consalvi in a further letter to Cardinal Fesch. The letter ends thus: "The concluding portion of the declaration not only assures His Holiness that the organic laws are not comprised in the words 'the laws of the Concordat,' but it leads him to entertain high hopes of obtaining from His Imperial Majesty that change and amelioration which since the moment of their publication the Holy Father has implored from the devotion and the wisdom of His Majesty."

To this heap of historical proof we will add but one more document; not that it is a bit more conclusive than many others we have cited, but because it was drawn up when Napoleon was crushed and may be said to represent the minds of the rulers who governed France for the first half of the last century. This is the third article of the new code of laws, drawn up in 1817, after the restoration of the Bourbons, which runs as follows:

"The Articles Organiques, which have been drawn up without the knowledge of His Holiness and promulgated, without any assent on his part, on the 8th of April, 1802, at the same time as the Concordat, are abrogated in whatsoever they are contrary to the doctrine and the laws of the Church."

From a perusal of these documents one thing is quite evident, that it is a historical absurdity to say that the Holy See was bound in any way by the obligations of the Articles Organiques.

We must now affect a rapid transformation from the days of Napoleon down to the opening years of the present century. Some troubles had arisen in the Diocese of Laval, as a result of which the Bishop of that diocese was, by order of the Pope, summoned to Rome. The command was sent by Cardinal Merry del Val to Monsignor Lorenzelli, the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, and by him transmitted to the Bishop. In executing this command the Nuncio violated the twentieth of the Articles Organiques, which forbade a Bishop to leave his diocese without the permission of the Government. Of this the Vatican took not the slightest notice. But not so the French Government. On the 19th of July the *Chargé d'Affaires* at Rome officially protested against this breach of the Concordat, as he regarded it.

"In summoning to Rome," he wrote, "directly and without the knowledge of the Government, a Bishop, who in his capacity of administrator of a diocese is subject to the Minister of Worship, the Holy See ignores the rights of the power with which it has signed the Concordat."

In his reply to this protest the Cardinal Secretary of State made it quite clear that the grievance brought forward by the Government was entirely imaginary, since the article violated was not one of the bilateral Concordat, but of the unilateral Articles Organiques. Ten days later France broke off diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

The question of who was right and who was wrong, therefore, depends to a great extent on whether the Holy See was bound to the obligations of the Articles Organiques. And that these articles never received the approval or tacit consent of the Vatican has, we think, been abundantly proved in this article.

W. J. HEGARTY.

Exeter, England.

THE LIVING WAGE—AN ENGLISH VIEW.

DURING the last few years a great change has been passing over the face of Economic Science. It is not merely that it has made great strides. It is not merely that, as in the case of other Sciences, such as Chemistry, it has abandoned hypotheses which, containing a partial truth, did useful service until a fuller expression of that truth became possible. This science has undergone a revolution. It has harked back to the past in the recognition of the fact that it is impossible for the questions of the production, consumption and distribution of wealth to be dealt with adequately without regard to the human will—without respect for ethical considerations. It is sometimes urged that it is no part of the function of economics to suggest lines of action. Still the science is based on certain assumptions as to the probable action of individuals, and if ethical considerations are omitted, the result is likely to be misleading. If and when self-interest prevails, certain results follow and these results are coördinated in the science. But if altruistic motives form the basis of conduct, we get an entirely different set of results, and these must be taken cognizance of in modern developments of economics.

In no department of economics is this of more vital and practical importance than in that which relates to wages, and it may be useful for our purpose briefly to trace the history of economic thought during the last century on this most important question.

Starting with the theory of the "wages fund" which was enunciated by Adam Smith and developed by Malthus and John Stuart Mill, wages were looked on for many years as depending entirely at any given time on the number of wage-earners. From the hypothesis that a certain amount of capital only was available for the payment of wages grew the idea that any increase in the population must necessarily lower the rate of wages and that a rise could only be brought about by a falling off in the population. This, then, was the assumption underlying the dangerous proposals put forward by Malthus and his followers on the subject of the limitation of the birth-rate. Backed as this theory was by the authority of J. S. Mill, it held the ground for many years. An account of the first attack on it was given by Goschen in his Presidential Address before the British Association in 1893. He said: "I still retain vivid recollections of the first revolt against the doctrines of Mill, whose influence in this department of human thought it would be impossible to exaggerate. Mill was then in the plenitude of his unquestioned authority. Youthful audacity was then, as now, skeptical in many directions, but to doubt or assail the doctrines of

Mill was the anathema maranatha, the unpardonable heresy of those my student days. One exception, however, there was to this submission to authority. There was one amongst us who attacked Mill's cardinal position. We mocked at our friend. We used to declare that this bold assailant dealt only in verbal puzzles, but he was very persistent when he could get us to listen. Still he made no way. The iconoclast was F. D. Longe, who may be reckoned as ultimately the first successful assailant of "Mill's Wage Fund theory." Longe brought out a pamphlet in 1866 in which he argued that there was a "fair" wage and an "unfair" wage, and that the rate was not mechanically fixed, but depended on the produce. The final blow to the theory of the wages fund was given by F. A. Walker in his classical treatise on the "Wages Question," published in 1876. He developed the new view that there was no necessary relation between capital and wages, but that the latter were really derived from the product of present industry, though they might for convenience be advanced out of capital. He looked on the laborer as the "residual claimant to the product of industry" after deductions for rent, interest and profit had been made. He does not seem, however, to have recognized any question of just wages, though he admitted what he called "necessary wages"—the minimum below which wages could not fall without reducing the supply of labor, and thus inducing an opposite tendency—namely, a rise in wages. Thus he tells us: "It is not meant that the employer is bound either by equitable or by economical considerations to pay the laborer in the immediate instance enough to support life in himself and family. The employer will, in general, pay only such wages as the anticipated value of the product will allow him to get back from the purchaser with his own proper profits thereon. If in a peculiar condition of industry he consents for a time to give up his own profits, or even to produce at a sacrifice, it is with reference to his own interest in keeping his laboring force or his customers together in the expectation that a turn in affairs will enable him to make himself good for the temporary loss. If he pays more than is consistent with this object, *or if he pays anything from any other view than his own interest*, what he thus pays is not wages, but alms disguised as wages."¹

Thus Walker assumes that motives other than self-interest can have no part in production.

Now, this seems a strange thing. If we take the profession, say, of medicine, we expect a doctor to be actuated by motives other than self-interest. He must indeed secure a living by his work, but if his chief concern is the heaping up of wealth rather

¹ "The Wages Question," F. A. Walker, page 109.

than the relief of suffering and prevention of disease, we should look on him as unfaithful to his calling. In his case we concede a motive other than self-interest, and we do not say he is giving alms to his patients because he gives them a devoted service which no money can buy. Again, in the case of an artist we do not expect self-interest to be the chief motive in production. Indeed, we are certain that the highest work cannot be produced, the artist cannot give us of his best, under this stimulus. He must be free to work for art's sake.

Yet in the production of ordinary goods it is almost universally assumed that the sole motive of the producer is to make a profit. Why must it be supposed that such a gulf exists between the moral equipment of, say, a lecturer—whose principal concern is not supposed to be his fee—and a manufacturer of any sort of material goods?

Recall George Eliot's poem in which Naldo, the painter, asks Stradivarius to tell him his motive in making violins:

"Perhaps thou hast some pleasant vice to feed
The love of louis d'ors in heaps of four,
Each violin a heap—I've nought to blame.
My vices waste such heaps." Antonio then:
"I like the gold—well, yes, but not for meals.
And as my stomach, so my eye and hand
And inward sense that works along with both
Have hunger that can never feed on coin.

'Tis rare delight: I would not change my skill
To be the Emperor with bungling hands
And lose my work, which comes as natural
As self as waking."

Why cannot it be conceded that love of art or love of humanity may enter into the motives of the ordinary producer? If people were educated to the idea that in any line of life one's own interests should not come before those of others, they would not look on this as an absurd position to take up. Of course, where the things to be produced were merely reprehensible luxuries or the outcome of ignoble desires, such motives on the part of the producer would be inadmissible. Enlightened public opinion must be trusted to put a check on the production of such commodities even if the demand exists.

It is constantly said that self-interest is the necessary stimulus to induce men to put out their best efforts, to risk their capital and so on, and an argument commonly used against the nationalization of the means of production is that it would destroy personal incentive to work. It is true that Socialism makes a great demand on altruistic motives, but this is its strength rather than its weakness.

Yet setting aside the question of Socialism, why not allow the possibility of self-regarding motives being subordinated to other-

regarding motives in the process of production? One revolts from the idea that all the delightful conveniences of life, such as tables and chairs and bookcases, were made not at all for the pleasure of satisfying those who enjoy their use, but solely for the sake of profit. One refuses to picture to oneself the want of imagination of a manufacturer of children's toys, who sees not the outstretched hands and sparkling eyes of the little ones, but some miserable gain that he may acquire. One would hardly dare to make a profit on such things, lest the children should lose a joy which was their right.

But the mutual rights and duties of producer and consumer are not now to be considered, but those of employer and employed. The question of motive, however, is equally in point. If the producer's motive is self-interest, he is not primarily concerned with the payment of a living wage. Indeed, Walker tells us that "in the vast majority of cases the wages which employers pay their workmen are governed by the price at which they may fairly expect to sell the product, and this whether the workmen and their families can live thereon or not."² And because men have grown up so largely with the idea that their business is a matter of procuring wealth for themselves rather than a means of serving the community, wages have in many cases fallen to a bare subsistence level or even lower, and we have seen the result in ill health, misery and vice. It is not realized forcibly enough that for many a woman living under the worst conditions of labor in the East End of London—yes, and in the West, within a stone's throw of homes of luxury—the only alternative to degradation is heroism. But not having the right to demand heroism from the ordinary woman, the duty arises of seeing that the conditions of an honest existence are provided for her.

Professor Cairnes has pointed out that there are in society a certain number of what he calls "non-competing groups" of workers. Thus there are (1) the unskilled laborer, (2) the responsible, though unspecialized laborer, such as the miner, the tram conductor, etc., (3) the skilled workman, (4) the class including clerks, small tradespeople, etc., (5) the class consisting of professional and business men.

The problem of the living wage concerns the first group alone, and of these Professor Taussig, of Harvard University, writes thus in his recently published "Principles of Economics": "A rate of pay for common laborers much lower than that for other laborers is assumed by most people to be part of the order of nature. But it is by no means a matter of course, and it is very much a matter

² "The Wages Question," F. A. Walker, page 110.

for regret. Freedom in the choice of occupations is one of the most important conditions of happiness, and the traditional position of the common laborer is due to the absence of such freedom. The disparities in earnings and in social position, of which this is the most glaring, are not consistent with the ideals that are dominating the civilized world. They are, most of all, inconsistent with the aspirations of democracy. It is probable that, even with the removal of all artificial barriers to free movement, common labor would still remain, as its present name implies, the most common and the **least** paid. But such great discrepancies as the world has hitherto accepted as a matter of course are not inevitable. They bring grave social dangers in the intensification of class prejudice and class struggles. They bring a false attitude in the rest of the community towards all manual labor—an unworthy contempt for indispensable work. An elevation of this group to a plane of higher pay and better social regard would indeed mean that other groups would be relatively worse off—they would no longer secure the fruits of hard labor on cheap terms; but it would mean a better distribution of happiness.”³

Professor Smart writes that “the lowest level of labor is not that at which the laborer dies for want of necessities, but that at which his labor becomes inefficient and unprofitable; where the laborer is cut off by the employer as ‘not worth his meat.’ Or if we put it in terms of the laborer, we must look on the laborer as he is—a machine brought to great perfection, not of strength, indeed, but of delicacy and complexity, in the making of which much capital has been sunk and risked. The question is not between starving and not starving the laborer, but between letting a fine machine go to rust and keeping it in first-rate working order.”⁴

Yes, and since man is something more than a fine machine, since he is an intellectual and moral being, he has other requirements which must be satisfied in order that he may lead a full human life. In addition, then, to the primary necessities of existence he may claim (1) reasonable leisure and recreation, (2) access to the means of culture, (3) the means of satisfying the desires of his nature from the ethical and religious standpoint, (4) the possibility of marrying and bringing up a family.

An objection to the doctrine of the living wage has been raised by Mr. Wicksteed. He does not deny that a man and his family are entitled to the means of subsistence, but he rejects the theory that this should necessarily come in the form of wages. He maintains that a man’s wage, under a system of open competition, is

³ “Principles of Economics,” F. W. Taussig, Vol. II., page 139.

⁴ “Distribution of Income,” William Smart, page 201.

what he is worth to his employer—the marginal value of his labor. "Hence," he continues, "if we say that any kind of service is over or underpaid in the open market, we must be speaking in accordance with some ideal conception; for instance, the idea of what is due to a man, as such, rather than what he commands in virtue of the significance to others of what he can do."⁵

One may perhaps start with accepting this statement and claiming for a man a living wage not so much as a *measure* of his work, but as a *return* for the work which is his sole means of support.

But, on the other hand, fictitious values of labor may be created in various ways. There is not really fair bargaining in the open competition of the market, since although labor may be as necessary to capital in the long run as capital is to labor, yet the laborer cannot afford to wait, and is therefore obliged to sell his labor at a disadvantage.

Again, custom and convention have much to do with the fixing of wages, and any change in public opinion of the question of fair profits and fair wages would affect the "marginal value of a man's labor."

In olden times in England a fair wage was looked on as every man's right, and Professor Ashley tells us that usual wages were probably reasonable wages up to at least the middle of the fifteenth century.⁶

Since a man has a natural right to marry, the living wage should be a family living wage when there is a family to support. This was admitted by Adam Smith, though not, it seems, on ethical grounds. "A man must always live by his work," he writes, "and his wages must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation."⁷

Here it must at once be admitted there is a certain danger. However much one may be persuaded that the family is the unit of society and that the man, as the head of the family, has the duty of supporting it, one must not lose sight of the fact that the wife and children have their individual rights apart from the man, and that their claim to subsistence does not rest solely on his power and will to work. If he fails in his duty, society may inflict punishment on him, but will assuredly supply his neglect.

Again, it is beginning to be recognized more and more that woman's work in a home is of great social value and is therefore

⁵ "The Common Sense of Political Economy," P. H. Wicksteed, page 339.

⁶ "Economic History," W. T. Ashley, Part II., page 335.

⁷ "Wealth of Nations" (1776), Vol. I., page 83.

entitled to a wage. Must this necessarily come through her husband's trade? Should it not rather be a charge on society as a whole? If so, this would point in the direction of adequate and continuous State endowment of motherhood and would simplify the question of the living wage by taking from it the element of variability according to the number of a man's family.

But putting aside this question of a State wage for mothers, there is still the necessity of a living family wage. It is suggested by some that this should be a fixed wage for a normal family—by which is meant an average-sized family. This would probably have the effect of limiting the birth-rate to this level, and the average would constantly decline. Another suggestion is that the wage should vary with the size of the family to be supported. Against this it is urged that it is entirely impracticable and that no one would employ a workman who had a large family.

Now, it is a fact that in many cases employers prefer married men to single men, and the reason alleged is that married men are more stable and dependable and less likely to throw up a situation. An employer who holds this view would be willing to pay higher wages to a married man. The same argument would hold good in preferring a man with a large family to a man with a small one.

Again, although in the case of a man with a large family his wage would reach a high level during a certain period, it would decline when the children became self-supporting. And also it should be remembered that there exist at present arbitrary standards of wages according to age and sex, but it has not yet been found that either sex or any particular age has been ousted from the labor market on this ground. And since arbitrary standards have been fixed by means of Trades Unions according to age, there is no inherent impossibility in the supposition that, with good organization and the backing of public opinion, similar results might be attained in the case of an increasing family. The principle of variation of income according to the size of the family has already been recognized by the abatement of income tax increasing with the number of children.

The payment of an average family wage to all workers, irrespective of whether they have a family or not, or of the size of their family, if they have one, can hardly be claimed as a matter of justice. For the claim to a family wage rests on the duty of supporting a family, and if a man has not exercised the right of parenthood, he cannot claim the means to enable him to carry out obligations which he has not incurred.

There are certain objections which have been raised, not so much to the principle of the living wage as to its practicability.

The first objection commonly made is that the payment of a living wage would entail a raising of prices, and that, therefore, only a nominal and not a real advantage would be secured. This argument is not altogether valid, for the class of consumers is larger than the class of wage-earners, and therefore the rise in prices being distributed over the whole community, the workers would get some advantage from their advance in wages, though not all the advantage which the nominal wage would seem to indicate. In some cases also wages are so small in relation to the price of the articles produced that a considerable rise would have very little effect on price. In so far as the objection is valid, it goes to prove that a real rise in wages can only be attained by altering the distribution of wealth. As long as enormous wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few, it is impossible that the mass of the people should be in other than extreme poverty.

Another objection which is often raised against the fixing of a living wage is that it would mean throwing out of work many elderly or inefficient workers who were not considered worth this wage. Professor Smart notes the fact that "employers compelled to pay the minimum rate are compelled to get their money's worth out of the workers, and so skilled men are superannuated at forty-five, till workingmen dye their hair and reject the friendly spectacles lest their age should betray itself."⁸

To this it may be replied that the tendency of the increased wage would be such as to render the workers more efficient, as they would be secured adequate food and clothing, improved housing conditions and so on. But some would no doubt be thrown out of work. On the other hand, some whose wages had been subsidized by the rates or by private charity would become independent. The net result, therefore, would be a better classification of labor according to efficiency—an altogether desirable result from the standpoint of the problem of poverty.

The last objection to be considered is that industries would not be able to bear the cost of the increased wage.

It is no doubt true that many individual employers would be unable to continue their business in spite of the fact that increased wages would have a return in more efficient work. The results of increased efficiency would not be immediately apparent and the small employer could not afford to wait. It must be expected that in any scheme of social reform, any readjustment of our industrial organization, there must be present suffering inflicted on individuals. Progress demands sacrifice.

It is not, however, true to say that the industries themselves would

⁸ "The Distribution of Income," William Smart, page 70.

not be able to bear the cost of a living wage if only reasonable and fair profits were made. Or, if it were ever true, it would show that the industry was a parasitic industry, thriving at the expense of human life. The argument that industries will not be able to bear the cost of improved conditions has been brought forward time and again, and as often disproved when the reform has been effected by legislation. As far as one can yet ascertain, the result of the working of the Trade Boards Act, which secures a minimum, though not necessarily a *living* wage, in certain trades, it does not seem to have a tendency to ruin home industry and drive trade into the hands of foreign competitors. And one may hope that at some future time the latter danger may be altogether obviated by an international agreement on the subject of a living wage.

The question of the *amount* of the living wage need not be considered. It will differ in the town and in the country; it will vary according to the reasonable standard of life of the worker.

It is sufficient to urge the *principle* of the living wage on the ground that a man has a fundamental right to live a full human life and that normally he can only secure that right by means of work and wages. It is this which is the pressing root-question of the hour—not mental deficiency. The security of a living wage for every worker will be a more potent and widespread factor in checking immorality; the improved conditions which it will be the means of providing will prove of greater eugenic value than the segregation of those feeble-minded persons who, in the words of the Royal Commission, are “capable of earning their living under favorable circumstances.”

To secure this living wage must ultimately be the work of legislation, but before legislation is had there must be right public opinion, and this can only be obtained if there are brought to bear on economic questions those ethical principles which are so deeply rooted in our nature.

E. C. FORTEY.

Leicester, England.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE

AD ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS AMERICAЕ LATINAE DE MISERA
INDORUM CONDITIOE SUBLEVANDA.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem:

LACRIMABILI statu Indorum ex inferiori America vehementer commotus, decessor Noster illustris, Benedictus XIV. gravissime eorum causam egit, ut nostis, in Litteris *Immensa Pastorum*, die XXII mensis Decembris anno MDCCXLI datis; et quia, quae ille deploravit scribendo, ea fere sunt etiam Nobis multis locis deploranda, idcirco ad earum Litterarum memoriam sollicite Nos animos vestros revocamus. Ibi enim cum alia, tum haec conqueritur Benedictus, etsi diu multumque Apostolica Sedes relevandae horum afflictæ fortunæ studuisset, esse tamen etiamtum "homines orthodoxæ Fidei cultores, qui veluti caritatis in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum diffusæ sensuum penitus oblii, miseros Indos non solum Fidei luce carentes, verum etiam sacro regenerationis lavacro ablutos, aut in servitutem redigere, aut veluti mancipia aliis vendere aut eos bonis privare, eaque inhumanitate cum iisdem agere praesumant, ut ab amplectenda Christi fide potissimum avertantur, et ad odio habendam maximopere obfirmentur." Harum quidem indignitatum ea quæ est pessima, id est servitus proprii nominis, paullatim postea, Dei miserentis munere, de medio pulsa est: ad eamque in Brasilia aliisque regionibus publice abolendam multum contulit materna Ecclesiæ instantia apud egregios viros qui eas Respublicas gubernabant. Ac libenter fatemur, nisi multa et magna rerum et locorum impedimenta obstitissent, eorum consilia longe meliores exitus habitura fuisse. Tametsi igitur pro Indis aliquid est actum, tamen multo plus est quod superest. Equidem cum scelera et maleficia reputamus, quæ in eos adhuc admitti solent, sane horremus animo summaque calamitosi generis miseratione afficimur. Nam quid tam crudele tamque barbarum, quam levissimas saepe ob causas nec raro ex mera libidine saeviendi, aut flagris homines laminisque ardentibus caedere; aut repentina oppressos vi, ad centenos, ad millenos, una occidione perimere; aut pagos vicosque vastare ad internecionem indigenarum: quorum quidem nonnullas tribus accepimus his paucis annis prope esse deletas? Ad animos adeo efferandos plurimum sane valet cupiditas lucri; sed non paullum quoque valet caeli natura regionumque situs. Etenim, cum subiecta ea loca sint austro aestuoso, qui, languore quodam venis immisso, nervos virtutis tamquam elidit; cumque a consuetudine religionis,

a vigilantia Reipublicae, ab ipsa propemodum civili consortione procul absint, facile fit, ut si qui non perditis moribus illuc ad-
venerint, brevi tamen depravari incipiant, ac deinceps, effractis
officii iurisque repagulis, ad omnes immanitates vitiorum delabantur.
Nec vero ab istis sexus aestatisve imbecillitati parcitur; quin imo
pudet referre eorum in conquirendis mercandisque feminis et pueris
flagitia atque facinora, quibus postrema ethnicae turpitudinis ex-
empla vinci verissime dixeris. Nos equidem aliquandiu, cum de his
rebus rumores afferrentur, dubitavimus tantae atrocitati factorum
adstringere fidem: adeo incredibilia videbantur. Sed postquam a
locupletissimis testibus, hoc est, a plerisque vestrum, Venerabiles
Fratres, a Delegatis Sedis Apostolicae, a missionalibus aliisque viris
fide prorsus dignis certiores facti sumus, iam non licet Nobis hic
de rerum veritate ullum habere dubium. Iam dudum igitur in ea
cogitatione defixi, ut, quantum est in Nobis, nitamur tantis mederi
malis, prece humili ac supplici petimus a Deo, velit benignus oppor-
tunam aliquam demonstrare Nobis viam medendi. Ipse autem qui
Conditor Redemptorque amantissimus est omnium hominum, cum
mentem Nobis iniecerit elaborandi pro salute Indorum, tum certo
dabit quae proposito conducant. Interim vero illud Nos valde
consolatur, quod qui istas Respublicas gerunt, omni ope student
insignem hanc ignominiam et maculam a suis Civitatibus depellere:
de quo quidem studio laudare eos et probare haud satis possumus.
Quamquam in iis regionibus ut sunt procul ab imperii sedibus
remotae ac plerumque inviae, haec, plena humanitatis, conata civilium
potestatum, sive ob calliditatem maleficorum qui tempori confinia
transeunt, sive ob inertiam atque perfidiam administratorum, saepe
parum proficiunt, non raro etiam in irritum cadunt. Quod si ad
Reipublicae operam opera Ecclesiae accesserit, tum demum qui
optantur fructus, multo existent uberiores. Itaque vos ante alios
appellamus, Venerabiles Fratres, ut peculiaries quasdam curas cogi-
tationesque conferatis in hanc causam, quae vestro dignissima est
pastorali officio et munere. Ac cetera permittentes sollicitudini
industriaeque vestrae, hoc primum omnium vos impense hortamur,
ut quaecumque in vestris dioecesibus instituta sunt Indorum bono,
ea perstudiose promoveatis, itemque curetis instituenda quae ad
eamdem rem utilia fore videantur. Deinde admonebitis populos
vestros diligenter de proprio ipsorum sanctissimo officio adiuvandi
sacras expeditiones ad Indigenas, qui Americanum istud solum
primi incoluerint. Sciant igitur duplici praesertim ratione se huic
rei debere prodesse: collatione stipis et suffragio precum; idque ut
faciant non solum Religionem a se, sed Patriam ipsam postulare.
Vos autem, ubicumque datur opera conformandis rite moribus,
id est, in Seminariis, in ephebeis, in domibus puellaribus maximeque

in sacris aedibus efficite, ne unquam commendatio praedicatioque cesset caritatis christianae, quae omnes homines, sine ullo nationis aut coloris discrimine, germanorum fratrum loco habet; quaeque non tam verbis, quam rebus factisque probanda est. Pariter nulla praetermitti debet, quae offeratur, occasio demonstrandi quantum nomini christiano dedecus aspergant hae rerum indignitates, quas hic denunciamus. Ad Nos quod attinet, bonam habentes non sine causa spem de assensu et favore potestatum publicarum, eam praecipue suscepimus curam, ut, in ista tanta latitudine regionum, apostolicae actionis amplificemus campum, aliis disponendis missionarium stationibus, in quibus Indi per fugium et praesidium salutis inveniunt. Ecclesia enim catholica numquam sterilis fuit hominum apostolicorum, qui, urgente Jesu Christi caritate, prompti paratique essent vel vitam ipsam pro fratribus ponere. Hodieque, cum tam multi a Fide vel abhorrent, vel deficiunt, ardor tamen disseminandi apud barbaros Evangelii non modo non inter viros utriusque Cleri sacrasque virgines remittitur, sed crescit etiam lateque diffunditur, virtute nimirum Spiritus Sancti, qui Ecclesiae, sponsae suae, pro temporibus subvenit. Quare his praesidiis quae, divino beneficio, Nobis praesto sunt, oportere putamus eo copiosius uti ad Indos e Satanae hominumque perversorum servitute liberandos, quo maior eos necessitas premit. Ceterum, cum istam terrarum partem praecones Evangelii suo non solum sudore, sed ipso nonnumquam cruore imbuerint, futurum confidimus, ut ex tantis laboribus aliquando christianae humanitatis laeta messis efflorescat in optimos fructus. Iam, ut ad ea, quae vos vel vestra sponte vel hortatu Nostro acturi estis in utilitatem Indorum, quanta maxima potest, efficacitatis accessio ex apostolica Nostra auctoritate fiat, Nos, memorati Decessoris exemplo immanis criminis damnamus declaramusque reos, quicumque, ut idem ait, "praedictos Indos in servitutem redigere, vendere, emere, commutare vel donare, ab uxoribus et filiis separare, rebus et bonis suis spoliare, ad alia loca deducere et transmittere, aut quoquo modo libertate privare, in servitute retinere; nec non praedicta agentibus consilium, auxilium, favorem et operam quocumque praetextu et quaesito colore praestare, aut id licitum praedicare seu docere, atque alias quomodolibet praemissis cooperari audeant seu praesumant." Itaque potestatem absolventi ab his criminibus paenitentes in foro sacramentali Ordinariis locorum reservatam volumus.

Haec Nobis, cum paternae voluntati Nostrae obsequentibus, tum etiam vestigia persequentibus complurium e Decessoribus Nostris, in quibus commemorandus quoque est nominatim Leo XIII. fel. rec., visum est ad vos, Venerabiles Fratres, Indorum causa, scribere. Vestrum autem erit contendere pro viribus, ut votis Nostris cumulate

satisfiat. Fauturi certe hac in re vobis sunt, qui Respublicas istas administrant; non deerunt sane, operam studiumque navando, qui de Clero sunt, in primisque addicti sacris missionibus; denique aderunt sine dubio omnes boni, ac sive opibus, qui possunt, sive aliis caritatis officiis causam iuvabunt, in qua rationes simul versantur Religionis et humanae dignitatis. Quod vero caput est, aderit Dei omnipotentis gratia; cuius Nos auspicem itemque benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, gregibusque vestris apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die VII mensis Iunii MCMXII., Pontificatus Nostri anno nono.

PIUS PP. X.

ENCYCLICAL OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS X.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

ON THE CONDITION OF THE INDIANS,

TO THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF LATIN AMERICA.

PIUS X. POPE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and the Apostolic Benediction:

DEEPLY moved by the pitiful state of the Indians of South America, our illustrious predecessor, Benedict XIV., earnestly pleaded for them, as you know, in his letter *Immensa Pastorum*, dated December 22, 1741; and as we have to deplore almost the very things which he deplored when he wrote, therefore do we hasten to remind you of that letter of his. Therein indeed does Benedict complain, amongst other things, that although the Holy See had long done a great deal to alleviate their sad lot, nevertheless there were even then "men who as it were wholly unmindful of the feelings of charity infused into our hearts by the Holy Ghost, presume not only in the case of the Indians who are deprived of the light of faith, but even of those who have been bathed in the sacred laver of regeneration, either to make them slaves, or to sell them as slaves to others, or to plunder them of their possessions, or to act towards them with such inhumanity as to hinder them utterly from embracing the faith of Christ, or confirm them the more in their hatred toward it."

The worst of these indignities, namely, slavery properly so called, was, by the favor of the merciful God, soon afterwards abolished; and towards its public abolition in Brazil and in other regions the maternal entreaties of the Church made to the distinguished men who governed those States contributed much. Gratefully do we acknowledge that their designs would have led to much better results had not difficulties many and great, both of locality and circumstance, confronted them. Although something then has been done for the Indians, yet what still remains to be done is much greater. Indeed, when we consider the crimes and misdeeds which still are commonly done against them, our mind is stricken with horror and we feel the deepest pity for that unhappy race. What, indeed, is so cruel and so barbarous as, for reasons often trivial and not rarely for the mere pleasure of inflicting torture, to put men to death by scourging or with red-hot irons; or, suddenly attacking them, to massacre them, killing hundreds and thousands of them together; or to sack towns and villages, slaughtering the

natives, of whom within these past few years some tribes have, we learn, been almost exterminated? To render minds thus savage, the greed of gain certainly contributes in large measure, but the very nature of the climate and the situation of those regions also contribute not a little thereto. For those regions possess a torrid climate, which infects the blood with a certain languor and enfeebles strength of character; and it easily happens that if some persons who are not of depraved morals betake themselves thither, finding themselves strangers to every religious practice, far from the vigilance of the State and almost deprived of civil society, they begin in a short time to grow depraved, and, little by little, all restraints of duty and of law being removed, they plunge into all the excesses of vice. Nor do they spare the weakness of sex or age; indeed one is ashamed to record the crimes and misdeeds which they perpetrate, acquiring women and children and trafficking in them, so that they may be said with truth to have surpassed the worst examples of pagan depravity.

In truth, when rumors of this kind reached us, we hesitated for some time to give credit to such atrocities, so incredible did they appear to us. But having been fully informed by many witnesses, to wit, by the greater number of you, venerable brothers, by the Delegates of the Apostolic See, by the missionaries and by other persons wholly trustworthy, we can no longer lawfully doubt that these things are true.

Resolved, therefore, for a long time past to strive, as far as in us lies, to repair evils so great, we beg of God, with humble and suppliant entreaties, that He may benignantly indicate to us some suitable means of remedying them. He, who is the most loving Creator and Redeemer of all men, as He has inspired us to labor for the salvation of the Indians, will certainly supply us with the means of effecting our purpose. Meanwhile, however, it affords us the greatest consolation to know that the rulers of those republics are endeavoring by every means to rid their States of this stain and of this disgrace; which endeavor of theirs we cannot too highly approve and praise. Yet in those regions, distant as they are from the seats of government, remote and for the most part inaccessible, either through the craft of evildoers who opportunely cross the frontier, or through the apathy and perfidy of the officials, these efforts of the civil authorities oftentimes avail little, and not unfrequently fail altogether. But if to the efforts of the State were united those of the Church, the desired results would be more abundant.

To you, therefore, venerable brothers, before all others we appeal to devote special thought and care to this cause, which is eminently

worthy of your pastoral office and ministry. And leaving other things to your solicitude and zeal, before all else we earnestly exhort you to foster diligently all those institutions in your dioceses which are intended for the well-being of the Indians and to take steps to establish such others as may appear useful for the same purpose. You will also employ all diligence in impressing upon the faithful their sacred duty of assisting the missions to the natives, who were the first to inhabit American territory. Make known to them that in two ways they ought to aid this enterprise, to wit, by collecting offerings and by the assistance of their prayers; and that not only religion, but also the fatherland itself demands this at their hands. And you, wherever proper moral education is carried on, that is to say, in the seminaries, in institutions for the young, in schools for girls, and above all in the churches, take care that there be no flagging in the inculcation and preaching of Christian charity, which regards all men as brethren, without distinction of nation or color, and which is to be shown not only by words, but by deeds. In like manner, no opportunity which presents itself of showing what dishonor is brought upon the Christian name by the reprehensible deeds which we have here denounced, should be allowed to pass.

As regards ourselves, as we reasonably cherish good hopes of the consent and favor of the public authorities, it shall be our principal care to extend, in these regions so vast, the field of apostolic enterprise, by instituting further missionary stations in which the Indians will find a refuge and a place of safety. Indeed, the Catholic Church has never lacked apostolic men who, urged by the charity of Jesus Christ, were not ready and willing to give even life itself for their brethren. And even to-day, when so many are averse to the faith, or renounce it, zeal for spreading the Gospel amongst the barbarians has not only not grown faint amongst persons of either grade of the clergy and amongst holy nuns, but is still increasing and diffuses itself more widely through the power of the Holy Spirit, Who, according to the necessities of the times, comes to the assistance of His Spouse. Wherefore we believe it to be our duty to avail ourselves the more abundantly of those means which are at our disposal for freeing the Indians from the slavery of Satan and from that of wicked men, inasmuch as the need which afflicts them is the greater. On the other hand, as those lands were by the preachers of the Gospel bedewed not only with their sweat, but also with their blood, we feel confident that from so many labors a gladsome harvest of Christian civilization will at length spring up and bear good fruit.

Meanwhile, in order that, through our apostolic authority, the

greatest possible efficacy may attend what you on your own initiative, or through our exhortation, are about to do for the welfare of the Indians, we, following the example of our predecessor already mentioned, condemn and declare guilty of a heinous crime all those, as he says, who "dare or presume to reduce the aforesaid Indians to slavery, to sell them, to buy them, to exchange them or donate them, to separate them from their wives and children, to despoil them of their effects or possessions, to carry or transport them elsewhere, or in any wise to deprive them of their liberty or to hold them as slaves, as well as to give counsel, aid or support under any pretext or plea whatsoever to those who do these things, or to teach and proclaim that all this is lawful, or in any other way to lend their coöperation to what has been stated above." We wish therefore to reserve to the local Ordinaries the power of absolving penitents from such crimes in the sacred tribunal of penance.

These things, venerable brothers, it has seemed good to us to write to you, in the interest of the Indians, both to obey the paternal promptings of our heart and to follow in the wake of so many of our predecessors, amongst whom is to be particularly mentioned Leo XIII. of happy memory. It will be for you to strive with all your might that our wishes may be fully realized. You will certainly have as supporters in this work the rulers of those republics. Surely the priests, and in the first instance those attached to the missions, will not fail to assist you by work and advice. In fine, all good people will doubtless assist you; and whether with money, those who can, or by other efforts of charity, they will favor an enterprise in which are at the same time involved considerations of religion and of human dignity. But what is of chief importance, Almighty God will assist you with His grace, as a token of which, and also as a proof of our paternal benevolence, we impart with all our heart to you, venerable brothers, and to your flocks the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 7th of June, 1912, in the ninth year of our pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XIV.: *Simony—Toour*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

That each succeeding volume of the Catholic Encyclopedia is up to the standard of the preceding volumes has become a trite saying. We have become so accustomed to it that we take it for granted. No one is surprised that it is so, but one should be very much surprised were it not so. The calculations of the editors as to the amount of space required for the whole work must have been very accurately made, for it is clear now that the book will be completed with the next volume and perfected in the supplemental volume, which will contain corrections, additions, indexes, biographies, etc., which belong naturally to a supplement.

Volume XIV. opens with a subject which occupies an important place in history, and which has been the cause of much misunderstanding, many calumnies and a great deal of controversy. "Simony" is here treated with that clearness, conciseness and completeness which is characteristic of the Encyclopedian and is gratifying to the reader.

"Socialism" is another subject of unusual interest at the present time, and the student will welcome this opportunity to get a correct understanding of this much-mooted question. The article on the "Jesuits," or rather the series of articles, is very complete, and welcome, because there is probably no subject which is more abused and about which men differ so much. Here is the truth stranger than fiction. "Spain" looms up big, occupying thirty-five pages. One of the most interesting and literary articles of moderate size is on "Stained Glass," by Caryl Coleman. It is a pity it is not illustrated.

"Syllabus" is important, because so often misunderstood, and because sources of information are few.

"Suicide" is timely, because self-destruction is becoming commoner every day, and the scandal of it is working havoc among persons of every age and all stations. A true knowledge of the gravity of it and its terrible consequences ought to be sufficient to restrain persons of faith who have not hitherto been courageous enough to resist the tendency.

"Theology" and "St. Thomas of Aquin" are treated in an ex-

haustive manner and are among the most important topics of the book.

Attention has been called to only a few of the more striking headings, but the volume as a whole furnishes information on a variety of subjects which cannot be readily gotten elsewhere and forms an important part of the whole work, whose value is beyond price.

THE LIFE OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. Based on His Private Journals and Correspondence. By *Wilfrid Ward*. With fifteen portraits and other illustrations. In two volumes, 8vo. Vol. I., 666 pages; Vol. II., 636 pages. \$9.00, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Cardinal Newman died in 1890; Mr. Ward's life of him was published in 1912. It is generally agreed that it is undoubtedly the most important book of the year, and that no biography in the English language has ever attracted more widespread attention or excited greater interest not limited to any country nor to any special class of persons, but extending to all thoughtful and studious men, irrespective of creed or nationality.

Mr. Ward could hardly expect a higher compliment for his work or greater commendation than this widespread interest, and the approval that has accompanied it. The universal attention which the life of Cardinal Newman attracts twenty-two years after his death witnesses the greatness of the subject; but the no less universal approval and unstinted praise which the work has won in so short a time speaks eloquently of the ability, the judgment, the zeal, the faithfulness and the fearlessness of the author.

The first impulse of a reviewer of this book is to summarize it. But that is very difficult. Cardinal Newman's life was so full that even Mr. Ward's biography, filling two large volumes, seems only a summary. Again, the reviewer is tempted to question the wisdom of revealing the inner thoughts of the subject or publishing his opinions of men and things which have been expressed in private letters or diaries not intended for the public gaze and set down in moments of disappointment or chagrin. But Mr. Ward's explanation of his reasons for following this course are convincing and carry the question away from the field of discussion. The other temptation, to dwell upon any particular epoch or incident of the Cardinal's life with special emphasis, is also to be rejected, because the conclusion to which one is led who gives any attention to the book at all is that it must be read from beginning to end by all who wish to know Cardinal Newman. Indeed, Mr. Ward himself gives us this warning. The Cardinal was always a big man, he could not

take any part in small things and could not take a small part in larger things. Whenever he appeared he was big and interesting, and everything that he touched became important. He was so much a part of the great events of the time in which he lived, and so important a part, that he must be understood in order to understand them. In a word, whoever would know the England of Cardinal Newman's time, must know the Cardinal, and whoever would know him, must know Mr. Ward's biography.

LIVES OF THE FRIAR SAINTS. Editors for the Franciscan Lives: *Very Rev. Father Osmund, O. F. M., Provincial, and C. M. Antony.* Editors for the Dominican Lives: *Rev. Father Bede Jarrett, O. P., and C. M. Antony.* Fcp., 8vo. Each volume, illustrated, \$0.50, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

ST. PIUS V., Pope of the Holy Rosary. By *C. M. Antony.* With a Preface by Very Rev. Monsignor R. H. Benson.

ST. VINCENT FERRER, O. P. By *Father Stanislaus M. Hogan, O. P., S. T. L.*

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, of the Order of Preachers (1225-1274). A Biographical Study of the Angelic Doctor. By *Father Placid Comcay, O. P.*

ST. BONAVENTURE, the Seraphic Doctor, Minister General of the Franciscan Order, Cardinal Bishop of Albano. By *Father Laurence Costelloe, O. F. M.*

ST. JOHN CAPISTRAN. By *Father Vincent FitzGerald, O. F. M.*

ST. ANTONY OF PADUA, the Miracle Worker (1195-1231). By *C. M. Antony.*

The lives of the saints should be widely read by all persons of a reading age, irrespective of nationality or creed, because they point the way to heaven in a practical way. The Church teaches her children constantly what they must do to be saved—what they must believe, what they must practice, what means they must use in order to make their faith live and bear fruit. Then she supplements her teaching by holding up before them the examples of the saints—men and women like themselves, who by believing and accomplishing have earned heaven. All who desire salvation should study the lives of these guides, which like luminous torches blazon the way heavenward.

It is to be feared that many persons do not make use of this effective means of drawing nearer to God. Various reasons may be given for this failure. Not all the saints are equally interesting; biographers sometimes fail to produce the natural man at all, because they give too much attention to the supernatural; the biographies are often unnecessarily long and tiresome, going into infinite detail, which interests only highly spiritual readers or special students. Brief, bright, interesting sketches of saints who led active lives such as men lead now and dealt with problems such as confront us at the present time ought to appeal to a very large class of readers.

Such a series we find in the "Lives of the Friar Saints." They are attractive and irresistible.

PSYCHOTHERAPY. Including the History of the Use of Mental Influence, Directly and Indirectly, in Healing and the Principles for the Application of Energies Derived From the Mind to the Treatment of Disease. By *James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.*, Dean and Professor of Functional Nervous Diseases and of the History of Medicine at Fordham University. 8vo., pp. 800. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

This book consists of material gathered from a course of lectures given by the author at Fordham University during the last five years. Addressed to medical students and not specialists, the language employed is as mechanical as possible, and was intended to be such as young physicians might use to their patients for suggestion purposes. The historical part is unusually full, because the place of Psychotherapy in the past is very important, and because Psychotherapeutics has appeared under so many forms that a historical résumé of its many phases seemed the best kind of an introduction to a book which pleads for more extensive and more deliberate use of Psychotherapy in our time.

This is probably the first time in the history of medicine that a text-book of the whole subject has been written. There have been applications of psychotherapeutics to functional and other special forms of disease, but not specifically to all the organic diseases.

The author modestly disclaims all hope to make a perfectly satisfactory text-book on such a subject at the first attempt. We feel sure that Dr. Walsh has succeeded in his work far beyond his expectations. His general education, his philosophical training, his full experience and his rare intellectual power fit him especially for a work of this kind, where such ability and such equipment are vitally important.

It is a subject which has attracted a great deal of attention lately, and one which is liable to much misunderstanding and abuse. It is particularly dangerous for the ignorant and unscrupulous, and Dr. Walsh's work should prove a protection against both classes, almost equally dangerous. One of the most interesting chapters in the book is the last, which treats of Religion and Psychotherapy, for it is here that men are most apt to go astray.

MIRIAM LUCAS. By *Canon P. A. Sheehan, D. D.* Crown 8vo., \$1.35, net; by mail, \$1.50. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The story of an Irish girl who starts out in life handicapped by some mystery connected with her birth and parentage and by a curse which hangs over her old home. Ostracized by "society," she

turns to the poor people for sympathy and affection and becomes an ardent upholder of their rights in spite of the cruel opposition of her guardian. From Ireland the scene is transferred to New York, where, after many adventures, Miriam finds her long-lost mother, and also her husband in the man who, with her, is destined to lift the curse from her home at Glendarragh.

Like all Canon Sheehan's stories, this one is very interesting. The language, the scenes, the characters, the incidents, all show the hand of the master and hold the reader to the end. The writer is at his best in Ireland. Those who admire him most do not like to see him leave it. He can take his readers to his native land and make them live there, breathing its air, admiring its scenery, learning its customs and making the acquaintance of its people. We are tempted to wish sometimes that he would show us more of the bright side. There is a little too much of the brown and gray, and these quickly merge into black when the shadows fall. If Canon Sheehan could see the Irish people with the kindly eyes of the late Henry Harlan, how his books would sparkle! Of course, we must make due allowance for the difference between Italian and Irish temperament and atmosphere.

When the author leaves Ireland and the Irish people he loses much by contrast. His picture of New York, where the heroine of the present story lives for a short time, would do for any large modern city, and the portrait of the street gamin whom she befriends is English and not American.

These remarks are not made in a fault-finding spirit or a disparaging way, but rather for the purpose of helping to make that which is very good even better.

THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC. An Inquiry Into the Principles of Accurate Thought and Scientific Method. By *P. Coffey, Ph. D.* Two volumes, pp. 465 and 366. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

An original work on logic is not possible in the strict sense, but a new book strictly up-to-date, because it shows that there is no contradiction between scholasticism and true modern mental science, and because the author is in touch with recent logicians and uses all modern means and methods, without, however, departing from the canons of traditional logic, is certainly worthy of serious consideration and a warm welcome. If further justification were required, it could be found in the equipment of the reverend author, who won his degree at Louvain, who is professor of logic and metaphysics at Maynooth, and who is the author of the "History of Mediæval Philosophy" and the translator of Professor de Wulf's "Introduction to Scholastic Philosophy."

Dr. Coffey very modestly says of his purpose in the present work: "The aim and scope of this treatise are more modest than perhaps its dimensions might suggest. It attempts, in the first place, to present in a simple way the Principles of the Traditional Logic of Aristotle and his scholastic interpreters; secondly, to show how the philosophical teachings of Aristotle and the Schoolmen contain the true basis for modern methods of scientific investigation, inductive no less than deductive; and finally, to extend rather than supplement the traditional body of logical doctrine by applying the latter to some logical problems raised in more recent times. But the treatment throughout is confined mainly to principles and is meant to be suggestive rather than exhaustive."

The book is a splendid contribution to philosophical literature and a most effective antidote for the false, defective and destructive systems of philosophy in all its branches that are being written and taught in many of the secular schools of the country and even in some of the highest and most pretentious.

CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatum, Nova Collectio. Editit Societas Goerresiana. Tomus Secundus et Tomus Quintus. \$20.00, net. Friburgi Brisgoviae: B. Herder.

This great historical work, begun about ten years ago under the auspices of the Goerres Society, which represents the best talent of United Catholic Germany, is carried forward with encouraging success by the appearance of these two volumes. There can be no question of the inestimable value of a full history of the Council of Trent. Its importance cannot be exaggerated from any point of view. Doctrine, discipline, ceremonial and morals in modern times are dated from it, because in it truth was confirmed, falsehood was denied, ceremonial and discipline were revived and corrected, calumny was refuted, and controversy ended. The history of previous councils may be read to a great extent in the Council of Trent, and if all those previous records were lost, the acts of the earlier councils would still be preserved in their repromulgation by the later council.

No one could estimate accurately the extent of this work who had not made an exhaustive study of it, or had not examined what has already been done by Dr. Merkle and Monsignor Eheses under the Goerres Society. The size of the volumes which have already appeared, the enormous amount of matter which they contain and the ground still to be covered is startling, and one can easily understand why a full history of the council did not appear sooner. To one who is at all familiar with the histories of Fra Paolo Sarpi

and of Cardinal Pallacino, this book will be acceptable at once as the arbiter between them from whom there is no appeal.

Four volumes have now appeared, and it is expected that the work will be completed in twelve volumes. As the edition is necessarily very limited, and in all probability it will never be reprinted, universities, seminaries, colleges and institutions of higher learning generally should secure copies at once.

THEODICY. *Essays on Divine Providence.* By *Antonio Rosmini Serbati*. Translated, with some omissions, from the Milan edition of 1845. Three volumes. Crown 8vo., pp. xxxiv. + 1,006, \$7.00, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Theodicy signifies "Justice of God," and it is used as the title of this work, because its purpose is to vindicate the Equity and Goodness of God in the distribution of good and evil in the world.

All three volumes treat of the same subject, but under different aspects. Although each book may stand by itself, and in a certain way may be said to exhaust its own special theme, nevertheless they are mutually related in such a way that one helps to complete the others. The connection of the three books is as follows: The first is *Logical*. It expounds and lays down the rules which the human mind must follow in its judgments regarding the dispositions of Divine Goodness, in order not to fall into error. It is intended to remove the first cause of errors which men commit in judging of the supreme dispositions according to which God permits evil, bestows good, and distributes both among His creatures. This cause is the want of logical cognitions. The second book is *Physical*. It is a continual meditation on the laws of nature on the essential limitations of created things, on the concatenation of causes. It combats another cause of errors respecting the dealings of Divine Providence, the want of physical cognitions.

The third book is *Hyperphysical*, and combats the third cause of errors common to censurers of Divine Providence, namely, the want of theological cognitions.

The importance of the work may be judged from this outline. It is not written for theologians, but for the people, and therefore the author has not adopted a rigorously scientific style. For the same reason also he has abstained from introducing certain more difficult speculations.

As no argument is used more frequently against the goodness and justice of God and even against His very existence than the co-existence of good and evil and their apparent uneven distribution, and as this argument is now being most extensively used by those who are preaching Socialism in the extreme and worse sense of

the word, the work takes on a special importance and greater value by reason of its timeliness. A summary of it in short, clear form for general distribution ought to do immense good.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. A New Life of St. Francis. By *Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.* With thirteen illustrations. 8vo. Price, \$3.50, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"It would, perhaps, be too hazardous to assert that Father Cuthbert has written the final biography of St. Francis of Assisi, but few will be found to deny that he has more nearly attained that goal than any of his predecessors. . . . It is not that we learn much which is definitely new about his life or character, but rather that his latest biographer displays a deeper insight, a finer sympathy than any of those who have gone before him; and this is as we should expect it to be. Who better than a Franciscan friar of "the poorest of all the orders" should understand *il poverel di Dio*, God's own mendicant? . . . We certainly shall not venture to join issue with Father Cuthbert on his own especial ground. Rather would we end as we have begun with the clear sound of praise, warmly commending to all lovers of St. Francis a work which thoroughly deserves a catholic welcome in the most literal sense of the word."

All reviewers can without hesitation subscribe to this declaration concerning this new life of St. Francis. Much has been written about him, some of it true and some fanciful. Probably no other Catholic saint has attracted so many biographers and so many readers outside of the Church. With many admirers he is a fad rather than a model. It is most important that the life of such a saint should be written by the sympathetic hand of a brother, a student and a scholar, lest truth should be lost in fancy and fact be confused with fiction. Father Cuthbert's "Life of St. Francis of Assisi" does this, and therefore it can be recommended to all serious-minded, devout persons who look upon the saints of God as His faithful servants, to be imitated and invoked, rather than as quaint figures to deck the walls of my lady's boudoir because of their girdled bodies, their sandled feet and their tonsured heads.

THE MASS. A Study of the Roman Liturgy. By *Rev. Adrian Fortescue, Ph. D., D. D.* Crown 8vo., \$1.80, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

A new book on the Mass seems superfluous at first sight, and yet any one who takes up Dr. Fortescue's book will acknowledge that it isn't. The subject itself is inexhaustible, and when an author

so well equipped and with such authority as Dr. Fortescue treats it the result is sure to be a very valuable contribution to the literature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The author tells us that his book is intended to supply information about the history of the Roman liturgy and does not treat the dogmatic side of the Mass. As the Roman (or Gallican) rite is the only one in which the Eucharistic service can correctly be called the Mass, the book is limited to a study of the Roman liturgy principally. The chapter about other liturgies and frequent references to them is for the purpose of putting the Roman Mass in its proper perspective and for comparison.

The book begins with an account of the origin and development of the Mass in general and goes through the service as it stands now, adding notes to each prayer and ceremony.

Although the author acknowledges that the present time is hardly the most convenient for attempting a history of the Mass, because never before have there been so many and so various theories as to its origin, the development of the Canon, the Epiklesis and other questions, we are sure that all students will welcome the book as a most valuable contribution to the solution of these questions and to the final and complete history of the subject.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C.*, author of "The Catholic School System in the United States." 12mo., cloth, net, \$1.75. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is the author's hope that the present volume, like the preceding one, may interest non-Catholic as well as Catholic students of education. His conviction, in undertaking and carrying on these studies, has been that so vast and important a thing as the Catholic parish school system, which has been built up at the cost of such heavy and continual sacrifice, which was begun in good faith at the time when denominational schools were the order of the day, and which long antedates the Federal and the State Constitutions, must command the respect if not the admiration of non-Catholics when they come to know it such as it is and such as it has been, and that it cannot fail to enlist the good will and sympathy of all those who can be brought to understand the real purpose for which it stands. It is only through a better mutual understanding in this way that Catholics and non-Catholics can ever arrive at a settlement of the "school question" that will be satisfactory to both.

The history of Catholic education in this country has been postponed too long, and we cannot be over-grateful to Dr. Burns for having taken up the work and for having carried it forward so

successfully. He was just the man for it. His educational studies and experience, his connection with Catholic educational work for many years, his active connection with the Catholic Educational Association as one of its founders and chief executive officers, all equip him in an exceptional manner for the task. The result is fully up to the expectation. This volume and its predecessor, "The Catholic School System of the United States," should make us proud of the work that has been done and strengthen and encourage us for greater efforts.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI. A Biography. By *Johannes Jørgensen*. Translated from the Danish with the author's sanction by T. O'Connor Sloane, Ph. D., LL. D. With five portraits and other illustrations. 8vo., pp. xvi.+428. \$3.00, net; by mail, \$3.16. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is a translation from the Danish of a work which has already been rendered into both French and German, and which has received considerable commendation from the Continental critics.

The author, Johannes Jørgensen, a writer of reputation in various fields, while a comparatively recent convert to Catholicism, has devoted several years to visiting the localities associated with St. Francis; during his pilgrimages he received constant encouragement from prominent members of the order, as well as assistance in his studies in the wide field of Franciscan literature.

In addition to the narrative, the author gives an important appendix, "Authorities for the Life of St. Francis of Assisi." In this he deals with the writings of St. Francis, his biographers, the Franciscan legends, the histories of the order and some authorities outside of the order. A special index to the appendix, as well as an index to the general narrative, has been provided. The book is illustrated by three portraits of St. Francis and two other full-page reproductions, printed in double-tone on cameo plate paper.

The reception which the work has already received in the original Danish and in France and Germany, after its translation into the languages of those countries, places it beyond adverse criticism. The translation is unusually good, preserving the truth and unction of the original without sacrificing the demands of the best English.

ECHARISTICA. Verse and Prose in Honor of the Hidden God. By *Rev. H. T. Henry, Litt. D.* 8vo., pp. 252. Price, \$1.25, net. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press.

Dr. Henry has gathered together in this very attractive volume some original and translated Eucharistic verse with comment he has published in magazines at various times during the twenty

years just past, and has added some hitherto unpublished matter. He has also included a few renderings from Latin prose, such as the Prayers for the Blessing of Vestments and the "Prayer of St. Augustine."

As the author says: "If any apology were needed for such a volume as this, it could reasonably be based on the fact that our English devotional literature is not rich in Eucharistic treatments and that in respect of appropriate verse (whether original or translated) it is especially inadequate."

Those who are familiar with Dr. Henry's work could give another reason, and one that is alone sufficient, namely, the excellence of it. The beauty of thought, the elegant English, the correct metre, the accurate rhyming, all stamp the author as a scholar and claim for him a place in the literary world which is distinctly his own. This book is not only a literary gem, but it is also a strong aid to devotion.

HIS GREY EMINENCE: The True "Friar Joseph" of Bulwer Lytton's "Richelieu." A historical study of the Capuchin, Pere Joseph Francois le Clerc du Tremblay. 8vo., pp. 112. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press.

Those who have read Bulwer's "Richelieu," or who have seen it played, will remember the monk Joseph as the antithesis of the Cardinal, mean, servile, sycophantic, a clerical Uriah Heep. Perhaps they will be surprised to hear that he was nothing at all of the kind. That, on the contrary, he was a man of distinction in the social, political and ecclesiastical world of his time. As Richelieu was the power behind the throne, so Pere Joseph was the power behind Richelieu, whom he was instrumental in leading to the high and commanding position he occupied, and whom he would have succeeded as Prime Minister of France and as Cardinal if he had lived. This is not a romance, but it is history, and it is well worth reading. Mr. O'Connor does not draw a picture to take the place of Bulwer's bad portrait, but he brings forth a historic character with all his credentials.

Would that all who have been amused and deceived by the ghost of fiction might learn to know and admire the real man of fact. But this is too much to hope for. Catholics, at least, should seek the truth and learn it.

THE LITTLE CARDINAL. By Olive Katharine Parr. 12mo., cloth, \$1.25. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The Little Cardinal" is a most absorbing novel in which piety, pathos and humor are happily blended. The author, Olive Katharine Parr, is a very gifted and a graceful, charming writer. At an early

age she followed the example of her mother, beginning a long-continued work in the slums of London. In this new book she has drawn the characters from life; consequently the story possesses a realism and an interest not to be obtained by imaginary plots. Miss Parr's former literary achievements give us an assurance that any new work of hers will be found worth while. This book is no exception; on the contrary, it is the finest piece of work we have had from the pen of the author.

From the moment that Uriel, "The Little Cardinal," is introduced until we lay down the book at the end, our eyes dimmed with tears, the interest is unceasing. It is the story of a child, a little boy, that every one, young or old, who has a heart within him can read and sympathize with. There is no sickly sentimentalism about it; it is simply an unusually beautiful story, charmingly told.

THE FOOL OF GOD. A Historical Novel of the Pharaohs. By *Andrew Klarmann, A. M.*, author of "The Princess of Gan-sar," "Nizra," "Life in the Shadow of Death," etc. 80., 533 pages, bound in artistically ornamented cloth cover, with gilt top, net, \$1.50. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

"The Fool of God" is a chapter from the life-story of the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt, the shepherd-kings of Chanaan and the sheiks of Araby. It opens up a vista into the dim and silent past of four thousand years ago, and discloses a variety of scenes as much soliciting our sympathy as the scenes of human activity, affection and strife of to-day.

Four thousand years is a long time for people to have been silent. But just for this reason it is fascinating to make them reappear before us and let them tell their own tale of joy and sorrow.

In his descriptions the author has preserved, with admirable mastery, the quaint tinge of original, antique and volcanic humanity characteristic of the people who made history in those mystic days of old. He has reproduced the archaic types, prosperous cities and picturesque landscapes of Egypt, Araby and Chanaan, with a faithful and sympathetic pencil and has woven a story of love and struggle into his tale.

THE NEW PSALTER AND ITS USE. By *Rev. Edwin Burton, D. D.*, Vice President of St. Edmund's College, Ware, and *Rev. Edward Myers, M. A.*, Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Patrology at St. Edmund's College. Crown 8vo., \$1.20, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This book is meant for the practical use of two distinct groups of readers: those who wish to form a clear idea of the connection between the new legislation and the old Rubrics and those who are beginning to say the Divine Office. Without explanation, the very

qualities which recommend the new Rubrics from a technical point of view may render the due appreciation of their contents somewhat difficult to those whose active duties render a careful study of their technicalities impossible.

We have first the Constitution, then a very complete history of the origin of the breviary and its reforms, proposed or accomplished, down to the present, and then a discussion of the characteristics of the new psalter. The book is closed with an unusually full and accurate index. The work is done so clearly and so interestingly that those who read the book must draw from it increased knowledge, devotion and faithfulness in the recitation of the Divine Office.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Conforming strictly with the Decree "Divino Afflatu." Dimensions: Length, $5\frac{5}{8}$ inches; width, $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches; thickness, $\frac{3}{4}$ inch; weight, per volume, $9\frac{1}{2}$ ounces. Price list of bindings, net: Real black flexible morocco, round corners, gilt edges, \$8.90; extra fine flexible rutland roan, round corners, marbled edges, \$10.00; black extra fine genuine flexible Alaska seal, half leather lined, round corners, gilt edges, \$10.50. Four volumes, 16mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.

As the Bull "Divino Afflatu" concerning the Breviary Reform goes into effect on January 1, 1913, all those who are bound to recite the Divine Office must get ready at once if they have not already done so. They can follow the new order in two ways—either by using the new Psalter in conjunction with the old Breviary or by getting a new Breviary which contains the new Psalter in place of the old one. Probably nearly every one has been following the former method in an experimental way during the present year, when the order was not of obligation; but when it must be followed daily, not many will be willing to keep two books at hand constantly and carry them about, when they can get one book that answers the purpose, that possesses all the good points of previous Breviaries, and that in some ways surpasses them. The new Breviary of Benziger Brothers answers this description. For completeness, practical arrangement and references it is unexcelled. Its special features are: Its remarkable size; fewer references than any other edition; its completeness, as it contains the newest offices in their proper places; its solid, flexible binding; its low price, and its large, legible type.

THE WAYS OF MENTAL PRAYER. By *Right Rev. Dom V. LeLodey*. Translated by a Monk of Mount Melleray, Ireland. 12mo., cloth, net, \$1.75. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A valuable method for souls striving toward spiritual perfection. The able Cistercian monk who adapted the work for English-speak-

ing people must be congratulated on the success of his undertaking.

Father Poulain, S. J., author of the "Graces of Prayer" and an authority on the spiritual life, says to the author of this book:

"Your descriptions of divine grace are exact; it is easily perceived that not only you have consulted books, but that you have also come in contact with favored souls, which is an indispensable corrective of theoretical knowledge. Your ascetic counsels are very solid. Throughout your work there reigns a tone of piety which will elicit responsive echoes in every soul."

HOMILETIC AND CATECHETIC STUDIES. According to the Spirit of Holy Scripture and of the Ecclesiastical Year. By *A. Meyenberg*, Canon and Professor of Theology, Luzerne. Translated by the Very Rev. Ferdinand Brossart, V. G., Covington, Ky. Royal 8vo., pp. 845. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

Dr. Meyenberg is an experienced professor of many years' standing in colleges and seminaries and is also a preacher of well-known ability, so often called to the pulpit in various parts of Europe that he has become one of the foremost pulpit orators of the day. His knowledge as a teacher and his practice as a preacher led him to understand the importance of homiletics in the education of seminarians and the necessity of making homiletics a practical science, if pastors of souls are to profit by its study. He found that the greatest difficulty for young preachers lies in the popularization of the rich contents of our holy religion. Therefore, he not only teaches the theory of homiletics, but he also puts his teaching into practical form by bidding his pupils go to first sources, Holy Scripture, liturgy and theology for matter, and then shows them how to do it. He intends that the book shall serve as a class manual and also as a sermon storehouse. It must not be thought of as a sermon book in the ordinary sense, made up of a collection of sermons which may be preached as they stand. It is rather an analysis of subjects, with suggestions and directions that will enable the preacher to produce a sermon. It has received the highest commendations in the original German and has run through several editions, and it should have a corresponding degree of popularity in English.

INNOCENT XI. *Sa Correspondance avec Ses Nonces* 21 Septembre, 1676—31 Decembre, 1679. *F. de Bojani.* Premiere Partie: Affaires Politiques. Seconde Partie: Affaires Ecclesiastiques et le Gouvernement de Rome. Rome: Decleé et Cie.

We have had biographies of Innocent XI, and monographs on particular important events of his reign; the correspondence of

ambassadors and other representatives of Louis XIV. at the Court of Rome have also been published; but now for the first time the correspondence of the Pope with his nuncios at the different courts sees the light. Until Leo XIII. threw open the Vatican Archives this was not possible. The first two volumes contains the Pope's letters from the time of his election September 21, 1676, to the end of 1679. Other volumes are to follow.

The historical value of these letters is very great. The comparatively long reign of Innocent XI., his great sanctity and zeal, the stormy times in which he lived, and especially his conflicts with Louis XIII., give to them a particular historical value which is much increased by the fact that they correct and complete the history of the period.

The work is really indispensable for all public and institutional libraries.

THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Parts I and II. 22. 1.-LXXIV. Literally translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 8vo., cloth, each, net, \$2.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We hope that the appearance of Part II. so promptly indicates an encouraging reception of Part I. and an appreciation worthy of the work. The English Dominicans cannot be praised too highly for their courage in resolving to give the great Summa to the English-speaking world. There can be no question as to the wisdom of such a decision, for the English-speaking world needs it badly. Those who doubted if the translation could be made in a satisfactory manner, and if the charm and accuracy of the original could be preserved, need doubt no longer, for these two volumes set all such questions at rest. We hope that the work will be continued and completed as soon as possible, for it is a notable achievement in the theological world.

THE EVE OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. Being the History of the English Catholics During the First Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century. By *Monsignor Bernard Ward*. With portraits and other illustrations. In three volumes, 8vo. Vols. I and II.—1803-1820, \$6.00, net; Vol. III.—1820-1829, \$3.75, net. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This volume brings to completion an important historical work, and at the same time, taken in conjunction with two other books that preceded it, closes the history of a period in England fraught with events of great interest to the Catholic world. "The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner" (1691-1781), in two volumes, by Edwin H. Burton, began this history; "Dawn of the Catholic Re-

vival in England" (1781-1803), in two volumes, by Monsignor Ward, continued it, and the "Eve of Catholic Emancipation" (1803-1829), in three volumes, by the same author, completes it. Monsignor Ward's share of the work was very great, covering the period between 1781 and 1829 and filling five large volumes. The work is admirably done in every way, and it seems almost a presumption to say so when speaking of a man so well known as the author. Its value is acknowledged without question, and its interest is sustained throughout.

THE CAMBRIDGE MANUALS OF SCIENCE AND LITERATURE. Bound in rose-colored art cloth. 1s., net, per volume. Or, in brown leather, 2s. 6d., net, per volume. \$0.40, net. Cambridge University Press, C. F. Clay, manager. London: Fetter Lane, E. C. Edinburgh: 100 Princess street. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A series of small volumes on literary and scientific subjects dealing with various aspects of thought and with the results of recent discoveries, in a form acceptable to educated readers in general. Under the editorship of P. Giles, Litt. D., and A. C. Seward, M. A., F. R. S. These manuals treat of such subjects as archæology, ethnology, history, music, philosophy, poetry, aviation, botany, geology, physics, psychology, zoölogy.

The authors are carefully chosen because of their special fitness, and the result is a very attractive series which is still growing. The books appeal to several classes of persons. They are excellent for beginners, giving a satisfactory, brief treatise of the subject under consideration and encouraging to further study; they are useful for review, bringing back in outline what has been already learned in extenso; they are serviceable in a supplemental way, because they bring a subject up to date which perhaps is known only imperfectly.

The convenient size in which they are made tempts one to slip them into the pocket or bag, and is in itself an incentive to study.

PSALTERIUM ROMANUM BREVIARII ROMANI. 12mo., 16mo., 48mo., \$0.70, \$0.80, \$1.00 and \$1.10, according to binding. St. Louis: B. Herder.

These are the publications of Desclee & Co. and arranged in sizes to match the various editions of their breviary. The 16mo. is printed from very clear type, on opaque India paper of excellent resistance, and it makes a book unusually well adapted for combination with the breviary when traveling.

The reliability and convenience of the liturgical publications of this firm are too well known to need comment. It is only necessary to say that their psalters are up to their usual standard.

ANNEX

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

ZON-8-48

ANNEX

ANNEX

Fa, 1, (9)
Fa, 2, (1-2)

ANNEX

NAME

DATE

205
A5123

American Catholic qua
1912.

v.37

ANNE

